VOLUME XL No. 4

The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS
MANOEL CARDOZO THOMAS T. McAVOY CHARLES H. METZGER
WILLIAM L. DAVIS ROBERT F. McNAMARA JOSEPH N. MOODY

Table of Contents

JANUARY, 1955

ARTICLES

Juan Donoso Cortés: History and "Prophecy" *Thomas P. Neill* 385

Moscow the Third Rome: Genesis and Significance of a Politico-Religious Idea . . *Cyril Toumanoff* 411

BOOK REVIEWS 448

NOTES AND COMMENTS 484

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 495

BOOKS RECEIVED 506

GENERAL INDEX i

BOOK REVIEWS

Jew and Greek. (Dom Gregory Dix). Thomas B. Falls 448

Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung Europas. (Theodor Schieffer). Francis J. Tschan 450

Catherine of Siena. (Sigrid Undset). Anna T. Sheedy 451

Wadding Paper, 1614-38. (Brendan Jennings, O.F.M., Ed.). Michael J. Hynes 452

Prophecy and Papacy. A Study of Lamennais, the Church and the Revolution. (Alec R. Vidler). Joseph S. Brusher 454

La politique religieuse de Léopold Ier. (A. Simon). Jane Miller 455

Pio IX e Vittorio Emanuele II dal loro carteggio privato: La questione Romana, 1856-1864. Parte prima: *Testo;* Parte seconda: *I Documenti.* (Pietro Pirri, S.J.). S. William Halperin 457

Brother Potamian Educator and Scientist. (W. J. Battersby). Thomas L. Coonan 458

Bishop Tamarón's Visitation of New Mexico, 1760. (Eleanor B. Adams, Ed.) Edwin A. Beilharz 459

The History of the Diocese of Boise: 1863-1953. (Cyprian Bradley, O.S.B. and Edward J. Kelly). Thomas F. Cleary 460

The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931. (Norman F. Furniss). Vincent C. Hopkins 462

The Genius of American Politics. (Daniel J. Boorstin). Paul Kiniery 463

This New World (The Civilization of Latin America). (William Lytle Schurz). W. Eugene Shiels 464

George Washington. A Biography. (Douglas Southall Freeman). John J. Meng 465

The American Revolution, 1775-1783. (John Richard Alden). John B. Heffernan 470

Traitorous Hero. The Life and Fortunes of Benedict Arnold (Willard M. Wallace). Howard J. Kerner 471

Benjamin Franklin and American Foreign Policy. (Gerald Stourzh). Martin F. Hasting 473

Americans Interpret Their Civil War. (Thomas J. Pressly). Frank L. Klement 474

G. P. A. Healy, American Artist. (Marie de Mare). John O'Connor 475

Hidden Threads of History. Wilson through Roosevelt. (Louis B. Wehle). Robert J. Cornell 477

Ideals and Self-Interest in America's Foreign Relations: The Great Transformation of the Twentieth Century. (Robert Osgood). Thomas H. D. Mahoney 478

The World Crisis and American Foreign Policy: The Undeclared War, 1940-1941. (William L. Langer and S. Everett Gleason). John T. Farrell 479

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XL JANUARY, 1955 No. 4

JUAN DONOSO CORTÉS: HISTORY AND "PROPHECY"

By

Thomas P. Neill*

Juan Donoso Cortés, Marqués de Valdegamas, died in Paris in 1853. Two years previously he had written to one of his friends that he would be forgotten until history vindicated his pessimistic view of Europe's future. "I have faith in my ideas," he added, "but, as I have already said, my ideas will not triumph until after the Deluge, which should come but has not yet arrived."[1] His French associate and admirer, Louis Veuillot, was more optimistic than Donoso Cortés was about the latter's reputation. "The reputation of Donoso Cortés will not die," Veuillot wrote in 1858, "it will grow. His thought, far

* Presidential address of the American Catholic Historical Association, New York City, December 30, 1954. Mr. Neill is professor of modern European history in Saint Louis University.

[1] Letter of June 10, 1851, to "a friend," in *Obras de Don Juan Donoso Cortés*, edited by Gavino Tejado (Madrid, 1854-1855), V, 145. The friend is probably Tejado, who was Donoso's loyal disciple for more than twenty years. Tejado published what he believed to be Donoso's complete works within two years of his death. Unfortunately, Tejado was not a discerning editor. He omitted much of Donoso's correspondence and a number of articles that appeared in French and Spanish journals. The chief value of this collection, perhaps, is the eighty-page biography of Donoso. In it are the data about Donoso on which all subsequent biographers have depended.

In 1903-1904 Juan Manuel Orti y Lara published a four-volume edition of Donoso's works which superseded a clumsy edition he had published in 1891-1893. The Orti y Lara edition contains letters written to Donoso, which Tejado had omitted, as well as a considerable amount of explanatory notes by the editor.

from falling into oblivion, will acquire greater influence in proportion as the symptoms which he foresaw manifest themselves."[2]

Donoso's judgment about his future reputation proved more correct than his friend's. Although he was known throughout Europe as a Spanish statesman and a Catholic critic of his age, his name and his writings were soon forgotten as material progress and relative social peace seemed to contradict his dire prophecies about Europe's future. Within the last twenty years, however, Donoso has been read and quoted with increasing frequency. His speech on dictatorship and a section from his *Ensayo sobre el catolicismo, el liberalismo y el socialismo,* e.g., are included in Bela Menczer's *Catholic Political Thought,* and in his *Meaning in History* Karl Löwith refers to Donoso's *Ensayo* as another *Civitas Dei.* The Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, which has concentrated on publishing the works of the fathers of the Church, saw fit to publish Donoso's complete works. Several articles on Donoso have recently appeared in English.[3] In

---

In 1945 Juan Juretschke edited the *Obras completas de D. Juan Donoso Cortés* for the Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos in Madrid. This two-volume collection contains some letters and articles in journals not found in previous collections of Donoso's works. Most important for this study are the "Filosofía de la historia. Juan Bautista Vico," and the "Consideraciones sobre el cristianismo," both of which appeared originally in *El Correo Nacional* from September to November, 1838. This collection is carefully edited by a competent scholar. Unless otherwise indicated, reference to Donoso's works will be to this B.A.C. edition.

[2] *Oeuvres de Donoso Cortés,* translated and edited by Louis Veuillot (Paris, 1858), I, vii. Veuillot depends largely on Tejado for his biographical information about Donoso, although he knew him well in his last years. Veuillot's biographical study is superior to Tejado's in that he understood the significance of Donoso's thought.

[3] Studies in English on Donoso can be summarized thus: three articles by Bela Menczer—"A Prophet of Europe's Disasters: Juan Donoso Cortés," *The Month,* 187 (May, 1947), 269-279; "Metternich and Donoso Cortés," *Dublin Review,* No. 444 (Last Quarter, 1948), 19-51; "Donoso Cortés 1809-1853," *The Tablet,* May 2, 1953. Thomas P. Neill treats him in "Juan Donoso Cortés—Spanish Catholic Layman," *Historical Bulletin,* XXVII (May, 1949), 77-78, 83-87; "Juan Donoso Cortés," *Catholic World,* CLXX (November, 1949), 121-127; and in *They Lived the Faith* (Milwaukee, 1951). Goetz Briefs wrote a pamphlet, *A Christian Statesman and Political Philosopher, Donoso Cortés* (St. Louis, 1938). Other articles are those of J. P. Mayer, "Donoso Cortés' De Civitate Dei," *Dublin Review,* No. 451 (First Quarter, 1951); Alfred de Cossio, "Donoso Cortés," *Dublin Review,* No. 440 (Spring, 1947), 30-49; John J. Kennedy, "Donoso Cortés as Servant of the State," *Review of Politics,* XIV (October, 1925), 520-555.

these studies he is compared with St. Augustine, called the prophet of Europe's disasters, and seen to be the first and most penetrating Catholic critic of nineteenth-century liberalism and socialism.[4] At any rate, the course history has taken in our twentieth century has vindicated many of the judgments Donoso Cortés passed on European society a century ago. It has, moreover, called him back from oblivion as a man whose life and thought are now considered worthy of serious study.

Donoso Cortés lived out his short existence in the maze of Spanish political life in the first half of the nineteenth century. Educated in jurisprudence but inclined by temperament to theology and history, he tended to analyze political developments theologically and to lecture his fellow representatives in the Cortes on the ultimate significance of each event in Spanish history. These speeches, his controversial articles written for French and Spanish journals, and his many long letters constitute Donoso's body of thought. Finally, less than two years before he died, he published his *Ensayo sobre el catolicismo, el liberalismo y el socialismo,* the volume which best expresses his mature thought.[5]

Although Donoso's enduring importance is as a thinker rather than as a statesman, nevertheless, Louis Veuillot unintentionally did injustice to his friend when he wrote that his life "contains little in the way of events and is, in a way, only the history of his thoughts."[6] At the age of twenty-three Donoso entered the Spanish political scene with an essay on the succession question. His argument so pleased Ferdinand VII that he was given a minor position in the Department of Grace and Justice. From this time, 1832, until his death in 1853

[4] This observation, which many scholars would contest, is made by Goetz Briefs, *A Christian Statesman and Political Philosopher,* p. 21.

[5] The *Ensayo* was published simultaneously in Paris and Madrid. French liberal Catholics attacked it as Manichean, Jansenistic, and fatalistic, but it received approval from Rome and an Italian translation was made in 1853. Two translations of the *Ensayo* have appeared in English, viz., *Essays on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism,* translation by William M'Donald (Dublin, 1888); *An Essay on Catholicism, Authority and Order,* translation by Mrs. Madeleine Vincent Goddard (New York, 1925).

In this study I am using the phraseology of M'Donald's translation of the *Ensayo,* since any other rendition would be forced. All other quotations are my own translation.

[6] *Oeuvres de Donoso Cortés* (Veuillot edition), I, vii.

he was actively engaged in Spanish political life, both in administrative and legislative capacities. He served several years in the Cortes, where his speeches were received as important political events. In the first half of the nineteenth century, at least in Spain, a speech could change men's minds. On one occasion Donoso's speech caused the fall of the Narvaez government, and on another he played a large part in bringing Espartero's government to an end.

Donoso supported the liberal Isabel II against the Carlist forces, with whom he seemed to have more in common. He served as the queen regent's secretary and as Isabel's tutor, and in the last years of his life he was Spanish ambassador to Berlin and then to Paris, where he died on May 3, 1853. Donoso was, therefore, acquainted with practical political matters. Baron Hübner, Austrian ambassador to France, described Donoso in his last years as "an anchorite lost in the arid steppes of the diplomatic world, an apostle preaching to the savage folk of the drawing rooms, an ascetic beneath the braided uniform of an ambassador. . . . More than to his own age, he belongs to the sixteenth century, to the Renaissance and the Catholic counter-reformation provoked by Protestantism."[7] Such a description of Donoso is essentially correct for the last few years of his life, when he had decided to enter religious life, but its implication—commonly accepted—that he was unconcerned with the practical affairs of statecraft is not correct.[8]

The historian who would analyze Donoso's thought finds that as a mature person he repudiated his earlier position. About a year before he died he wrote in protest to the editor of the Madrid *Heraldo*, who had quoted some of Donoso's earlier writings: "Between your doctrines, which I myself professed when I was still quite young, and those which I now profess there is a radical contradiction and an invincible repugnance."[9] Donoso believed that he had experienced two "conversions" in his lifetime, one religious and the other intellec-

[7] Quoted by Bela Menczer, "A Prophet of Europe's Disasters: Juan Donoso Cortés," *The Month*, 187 (May, 1947), 271.

[8] The reading of Donoso's lesser works and a close examination of his career in Spanish political life refutes this popular misconception of his "impracticality." The best treatment of Donoso's political career is John J. Kennedy, "Donoso Cortés as Servant of the State," *Review of Politics*, XIV (October, 1952), 520-555.

[9] Letter of April 15, 1852, to the editor of the *Heraldo*. Donoso goes on to sum up this contradiction in these terms: "You believe that rationalism is the

tual. The first brought to life the faith in which he was born; the second changed him from a liberal to a Catholic thinker.

Neither of these "conversions" was as sudden or as radical as Donoso believed. His remarks in later life about his lack of religion must be taken with considerable reservation because of his tendency to see everything as black or white. He was blind to all shades of gray. He seems to have always been a believing Catholic, but in his earlier years he was probably lax in the practice of his religion. The death of his young wife and their daughter in 1835 overwhelmed Donoso with sorrow that remained acute many years later and caused him to censure himself with the way he had "neglected" her.[10] At any rate, by 1837, when he was twenty-eight, he put the claims of faith over those of unaided reason in his writings. But the sudden "conversion" of which he writes did not occur until 1846. His stay in Paris from 1840 until 1843 put him in contact with the writings of De Maistre and De Bonald and, more important, in association with a certain "saintly man" whose holy life made Donoso realize that he had failed to supernaturalize his own life within the Church. This experience, and witnessing his brother's edifying death in 1846, are the two experiences to which Donoso ascribes his "conversion."[11]

In his last years, when he wrote his most important works, Donoso was a thoroughly religious man, one whose actions and thoughts were all informed by a consciousness of the presence of God and of

---

means for arriving at the reasonable; that liberalism in theory is the means of arriving at liberty in practice; that parliamentarianism is the means of creating good government; that discussion is to truth as the means are to the end; and finally, that kings are nothing else than the incarnation of human law. I believe, on the contrary, that human law does not exist, and that there is no law except divine law. In God is the law and the concentration of all rights; in man is obligation and the concentration of all duties. . . . As for parliamentarianism, liberalism, and rationalism, I believe that the first is the negation of government, the second is the negation of liberty, and the third is the affirmation of folly."—In B.A.C., II, 605-606.

[10] It was Veuillot's opinion that Donoso had not been as remiss in his husbandly duties as the latter reproachfully thought. Cf. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, I, xiii.

[11] Donoso discusses the matter of his "conversion" in a letter to the Marqués de Raffin, written from Berlin on July 21, 1849. B.A.C., II, 224-227. In the letter he claims that the two things which kept him in the Church were: "the delicate sentiment which I have always had of moral beauty, and a tenderness of heart which approaches weakness; the first caused me to admire Catholicism, the second made me love it."

man's obligations to Him. He visited the poor in Paris almost daily, and his biographers claim that he gave five-sixths of his income to charity. His favorite authors in these last years were the great Spanish mystics. It is not too much to say that by 1849 Donoso had renounced the world in disgust. His urge to the contemplative life, he feared, was a form of laziness. He, therefore, determined to enter the Society of Jesus, but he died before he could carry out this plan.[12]

More important for an understanding of Donoso's thought than his religious conversion is his intellectual conversion away from liberalism and rationalism to conservatism and faith.[13] Donoso's formal education had been in a liberal atmosphere at the University of Salamanca (1820-1821), the College of Caceres (1821-1823), and the University of Seville (1823-1828). More important, it seems, were the summers he spent under the tutelage of Manuel José Quintana, one of the leading liberals of the period and a man of superior ability. From Quintana and from formal college courses Donoso absorbed the ideas of the Enlightenment. A precocious student, he was recommended by Quintana for a professorship at the College of Caceres when it reopened in 1829. The nineteen-year-old professor's lectures and writings show him to be a typical liberal thinker. He never accepted the materialism and empiricism of the radical thinkers of the Enlightenment, but he was a thorough-going rationalist. He attracted sufficient attention with his literary and journalistic efforts that, when the liberals wanted to revive the languishing Ateneo of Madrid, they asked him to deliver a series of lectures to the Ateneo members.

Donoso's tenth lecture, given in February, 1837, marks his break from rationalism.[14] He remained a moderate liberal for about another

[12] In a letter from his home in Spain Donoso wrote to Veuillot about his religious interests and his reading. Some biographical sketches state that Donoso had become a Jesuit before he died. A check with the archivists of the order in Paris and in Rome showed that he was not enrolled at the time of his death. Veuillot states that Donoso had made preliminary preparations to enter the order. Cf. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, I, lxiv.

[13] The best treatment of this problem in English is the first chapter of the unpublished dissertation by Raymond F. Copeland, S.J., "Donoso Cortés and his Social Thought," Saint Louis University, 1950.

[14] Some authorities put the break at a later date, as, e.g., Ludwig Fischer in his preface to *Der Staat. Katholische Geschichtsphilosophie*, which is an annotated translation of the *Ensayo*. Fischer says that Donoso's *Relaciones entre Francia y España*, which appeared late in 1838, marks his formal break from rationalism.

decade. During this time he discarded his remaining rationalist ideas one by one and adopted Catholic writers, especially the fathers, as his authorities. But his thought from 1837 until his death is substantially of a piece. Religion is more emphasized and autonomous reason more deprecated as time passes, but the change is one of emphasis rather than character. Perhaps the experience of European-wide revolution in 1848 can be looked upon as marking the last intellectual change in Donoso's life. The upheavals of that year convinced him of the rightness of his beliefs; they led him to maintain, moreover, that Europe was at the beginning of a cataclysmic crisis that would bring European "rationalist" civilization to an end and usher in the dark night of socialist tyranny. His writings in these last five years took on a prophetic tone, and at times they bordered on fideism and traditionalism—a point which liberal French Catholics made against the *Ensayo* when it appeared in 1851.

Donoso Cortés was first and foremost an orator. As an orator he painted word pictures in deep colors, sweeping his large brush of generalization across the face of Europe without the scholar's concern for fine points of detail. He appealed to the general public, as his defenders hastened to show,[15] and he did not water down the impact of his speech or his writing with scholarly distinctions or academic qualifications. The student must, therefore, take the full impact of his speeches, rather than pick out phrases, if he is to understand Donoso's thought properly. As a controversialist he painted pictures in stark black and white, and as a typical Spaniard he saw issues as simple either/or choices to be made with no reservation, with final commitment of the whole person. It is easy, then, to make Donoso appear absurdly reactionary by quoting certain passages instead of putting each sentence in the context of his entire thought.[16]

[15] When the polemic about Donoso's *Ensayo* was at its height, *L'Armonia* and the *Civiltà Cattolica* defended him against the strictures of Abbé Gaduel in Dupanloup's *L'ami de la religion*. Both defenses dwelt on the point that Donoso was not writing technical theological treatises but rather popularized theology "in the manner of De Maistre." These articles are in the appendix of Veuillot's edition of Donoso's works, III, 511-539, and in the Orti y Lara collection, I, 339-370.

[16] Typical of Donoso's extreme way of stating his point is this sentence in a letter to Montalembert: "I believe that Catholic civilization contains good without any mixture of evil, and that the philosophic civilization contains evil without any mixture of good."—B.A.C., II, 207.

Throughout his lifetime Donoso showed a keen interest in history, especially in what he termed "the philosophy of history." Although he was in command of a mass of historical data uncommon even for the professional historian of his day, still his interest was never in history for its own sake. The past, he believed, is to be studied in order to understand the present. "Knowledge of the past is an indispensable preparation for an exact knowledge of the present. . . . I believe that a question can be studied at its terminal point only when it has been well understood at its point of origin."[17] Donoso was not, strictly speaking, an historian; he had neither the temperament nor the equipment for the job. Temperamentally he was rather a philosopher of history. Even at the age of fourteen, when he made a rather comprehensive outline of universal history, he showed this disposition clearly. This outline is remarkable enough for the young man's judicious selection of material, but especially for the commentary which revealed what Donoso thought of special significance. He cites Jason's expedition, for example, as a type of elemental group-effort in which the individual is the center around which the multiple effort rallies.[18] He is not concerned with asking the professional historian's questions about this or any other event. He is interested rather with each event's significance.

Donoso is important as a philosopher of history, then, rather than as an historian.[19] On the basis of his philosophy of history he passed judgment on his age and made predictions about the future of European civilization. His *Ensayo* is the best published expression of his philosophy of history, but his most pertinent remarks about the nature of history are to be found in his posthumously published *Bosquejos*

[17] "Antecedentes sobre la cuestión de Oriente," B.A.C., I, 605.

[18] This work is not included in any collection of Donoso's writings. It is described by Tejado, who apparently saw the manuscript among Donoso's papers. Cf. Tejado, *op. cit.*, I, x-xi.

[19] We use the terms "philosopher" and "philosophy of history" in the general sense in which they are ordinarily understood. In this sense it means one who generalizes about history and considers it in relation to theology and/or philosophy. It does not necessarily mean a systematic body of general principles that deal with the ultimate laws of history. Donoso should more properly be said to have had a theology of history. But he himself frequently uses the term "philosophy of history," and his *Ensayo* is often compared with St. Augustine's *Civitas Dei* as a classic expression of a "Catholic philosophy of history."

historicos.[20] In these reflections Donoso defines history in two different ways.

> History, considered in general, is the biography of the human race. This biography includes all events which are of interest to humanity, and the exposition of their causes.[21]
>
> History, considered in general, is a record of events which make manifest the designs of God for humanity and their realization in time, either by God's direct and miraculous intervention or by the action of man's freedom.[22]

History is divided by Donoso into two ages: ancient history, which covers the time from creation until the coming of Christ; and modern history, which begins with the birth of Christ and lasts till the present. Each of these periods is subdivided by reason of subject matter into secular and religious history, and by reason of climactic events into a number of ages. Modern history, e.g., is divided into three periods: (1) the Roman Empire and the first centuries of Christianity; (2) the Middle Ages; (3) history since the Protestant Revolt. Donoso's division of history is made on the basis of significant religious events rather than on the rise or fall of empires. His division of all history into the period before Christ and the period after Christ is neither original nor unique, but it is an unusual division for the mid-nineteenth century.

[20] B.A.C., II, 111-157. These reflections were written in 1847. They were first published in 1854 in the third volume of Tejado's *Obras de Don Juan Donoso Cortés*. Almost all the reflections in this work can be found, implicitly or explicitly, in the *Ensayo* and in briefer form in his letters to Cardinal Fornari and to the editor of the *Revue des deux mondes*.

Donoso's views on the nature of history and his resulting interpretation of each event are not the same in his mature thought as in his earlier writings. In 1838 he accepts, with qualification, Vico's philosophy of history and quotes Guizot approvingly. In his essay on Vico he refers to Bossuet as the first philosopher of history. In 1847 he refers to Augustine's *Civitas Dei* as a sublime work and the first philosophy of history. In a letter of May 26, 1849, he rejects Vico's philosophy of history. This change of thought made him reverse his interpretation of the significance of each historical event. As a young man, e.g., he considered the Peace of Westphalia the result of consummate diplomatic skill; as a mature thinker he looked upon it as disastrous capitulation to the forces of disintegration.

[21] B.A.C., II, 113.

[22] *Ibid.*, II, 114.

The most important events in history for Donoso were the fall, the Redemption, and the Protestant Revolt. Around these events, he believed, one could group all the significant events of history. He chose these events as most important, not only because of their effects on civilization in the moral order—which he quickly admitted—but chiefly because he believed that a theology underlay every civilization. "Every affirmation relative to society or to government," he wrote, "supposes an affirmation relative to God; or, what amounts to the same thing, every political and social, is necessarily converted into a theological, truth."[23] Oversimplifying a connection that experts in the sociology of religion are studying even today, Donoso asserted that monarchy is the political counterpart of belief in a personal God, limited monarchy is the political result of deism, and a republic is the political aspect of pantheism.[24]

For Donoso the proper object of history is God and man "considered as free and active beings."[25] He insists that any history of man without God cannot be true history, for "God is the beginning, the end, and the milieu of history."[26] The philosopher of history in Donoso tends to rush past the secondary and sometimes obvious causes with which historians are ordinarily concerned to make theological rather than strictly historical assertions. "God speaks through the prophets, resists with the martyrs, triumphs with the warriors, teaches through the doctors, conquers with the conquerors, edifies by the saints."[27]

Donoso, therefore, insisted that one must eventually go back to God Himself in order to understand humanity and its actions in history. In later life he insisted vehemently and incessantly that one who did not know theology was, indeed, ignorant of all things.[28] By

[23] *Ensayo,* B.A.C., II, 349.

[24] Speech of January 30, 1850, "Sobre la situación general de Europa," B.A.C., II, 299-315.

[25] "Bosquejos Historicos," B.A.C., II, 111.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] *Ibid.*, II, 133-134.

[28] Donoso asserted that one must eventually go back to God Himself to understand humanity in 1843. Cf. his review of Fermin Gonzalo Moron, *Curso de historia de la civilización de España,* in B.A.C., I, 931-946. In his *Ensayo* he asserts strongly both the superiority and the all-inclusiveness of theology, "the ocean which contains and embraces all sciences" (B.A.C., II, 347). In this opening chapter of the *Ensayo* Donoso insists that political and social sciences do not exist, except as arbitrary classifications of the mind, and that whenever one speaks of anything he implicitly speaks of God.

this time (1847) he had decided that the purpose of history was to explain the three "miracles" of creation, of the conservation of the human race, and of God's mercy and justice.[29] One might, therefore, say that Donoso had come to consider the Bible the primary source of knowledge, in which God revealed Himself most clearly and most directly, and history as a supplementary source in which God reveals Himself to those who read with faith.

Providence is one of the obvious facts of history in Donoso's opinion. "He who has no notion of the providence of God is in the most complete ignorance of all things."[30] When men think that they themselves design the pattern of history and are responsible for its events they indulge in fatuous presumption, for Providence is silently weaving the design into the tapestry of history which has been in the mind of God from all eternity.[31]

> The fountains flow because God commands them to flow with an actual commandment; and He commands them to flow because today, as in the day of their creation, He sees it is good they should flow. The trees fructify because God commands them to fructify with an actual commandment; and He gives them this commandment because today, as in the day of their creation, He sees it is good that trees should bear fruit. Hence we see how much in error are those who seek the explanation of events either in secondary causes, which all exist in general and immediate dependence on God, or in chance, which does not exist at all. God alone is the Creator of all that exists, the preserver of all that subsists, and the author of all that happens, according to the words of Ecclesiasticus (xi. 14), "Good things and evil, life and death, poverty and riches, are from God."[32]

Through all Donoso's definitions of history runs the refrain that history is a record of events that manifest the designs of Providence, "the only general cause of all human events."[33] Following the generally accepted Catholic teaching on this matter, Donoso tells the reader that Providence acts in two ways: naturally through secondary causes, and supernaturally "when it provokes events directly, imme-

[29] "Bosquejos Historicos," B.A.C., II, 111.
[30] *Ensayo*, B.A.C., II, 386.
[31] Letter of June 19, 1852, to Cardinal Fornari, B.A.C., II, 613-630.
[32] *Ensayo*, B.A.C., II, 387.
[33] "Bosquejos Historicos," B.A.C., II, 113.

diately and miraculously."[34] For Donoso, then, God is very literally the milieu of history, as well as its beginning and its end.

History is concerned with two beings: God and man, the former possessed of unlimited freedom, the latter free in the confines of time and space. "Beyond the action of God there is only the action of man; beyond divine providence there is nothing but human liberty. The combination of this liberty with that providence constitutes the rich and varied course of history."[35] In the face of his contemporaries' idealization of man, Donoso held him in low opinion, almost in contempt. "If my God had not taken flesh in the womb of a woman," he wrote, "nor died on the cross for the whole human race, the reptile I tread on would be less despicable in my eyes than man. . . . To believe in the nobility of those stupid crowds, it was necessary for God to reveal it to me."[36] Donoso insisted that as a result of original sin man's will is naturally inclined to evil and his mind naturally attracted by error.[37] His strong insistence on this point against liberals of the time aroused opposition among some of the French Catholics, but Donoso insisted that history proved the correctness of his assertion.

In the order of creation man is both a slave and a king, and he is king of creation, Donoso tells his readers, only as long as he remains God's slave. "Each of his acts of sovereignty is an act of obedience."[38] Since God has established all things in perfect balance and appropriate relationships, it behooves man to keep humbly to the place assigned him in the divine pattern rather than bustle about deranging created order or presuming to impose his own bungling pattern on society.

[34] *Ibid.* [35] *Ensayo*, B.A.C., II, 397. [36] *Ibid.*, II, 532.

[37] It is difficult to read Donoso's statements on the effects of original sin in any sense except that condemned by the Council of Trent as Protestant. In the *Ensayo*, e.g., he wrote: "The understanding of man withdrew from the divine understanding, which was equivalent to separating from truth; separated from truth, it ceased to understand it. The human will withdrew from the divine, which was equal to separating from the good; separated from the good, it ceased to will it. . . . Error, which is the negation of truth, was, then, the term of his understanding; evil, which is the negation of the good, of his will; and the term of his actions was sin, which is the simultaneous negation of truth and goodness, which are different manifestations of the same thing, considered in two different points of view."—*Ensayo*, B.A.C., II, 416-417.

[38] "Bosquejos Historicos," B.A.C., II, 125.

Those peoples alone have been both respectful and free, and those governments alone have united moderation and strength, who show the least trace of human interference, but whose institutions have rather been the result of the slow, steady growth which characterizes everything that has stability in the domain of time and of history.[39]

Donoso indicts the rationalist historians, such as Voltaire, for failing to see a providential God and sinful man as the two actors in history. As a result, he claims:

They drew up in their minds [without reference to outside reality] the laws which govern society; they established arbitrary relationships between things, capriciously transforming the rightly drawn relationship between Creator and creatures, pretending to be like God who, with a single word, brought light from darkness and order from chaos.

History then ceased to be what it had been when written by Catholic scholars—a simple and majestic presentation of facts. It became the dogmatic exposition of a social or philosophical theory that was intolerant and inflexible. Philosophers rose against philosophers, theories against theories, systems against systems, resulting in such confusion that men were on the verge of not being able to distinguish truth from error and not knowing what to think about God, about man, or about the human race.[40]

Although his strictures in later life against the rationalists were severe, still Donoso kept a number of their ideas about history in somewhat modified form. At a time when professional historians tended to limit their considerations to political events, Donoso followed the tradition of Voltaire in considering a civilization the only comprehensible unit of history. Any more specialized focus into which a people's life could be drawn, such as political or literary history, would yield but a meager, inadequate account of their vital experience.[41]

From the Bible and from his study of history Donoso derived a number of "historical laws" on which he based his criticism of his age and his predictions as to its future. One of these was the "law of solidarity" by which he sought to explain the transmission of sin from the first parents. For him solidarity had not only a horizontal axis, along which life was linked to life across the entire face of the

[39] *Ensayo*, B.A.C., II, 503.

[40] "Bosquejos Historicos," B.A.C., II, 112.

[41] Review of Fermin Gonzalo Moron, *Curso de historia de la civilización de España*, B.A.C., I, 931-933.

earth, but an even more significant vertical axis along which each generation is linked to generations past and to generations yet unborn. Because of this concept of solidarity, words and deeds acquired appalling momentum and potentiality for Donoso as they moved outward from their source to reverberate through others' lives, where they again became epicenters of other chains of causality that would continue to influence untold numbers of lives until the very end of time. This abiding realization of the intimate interdependence of life upon life, combined with the strong conviction that political and social systems derive from religious doctrine, made Donoso acutely aware of the menace of heresy not only to the heretic but to society as a whole.

This concept of solidarity led Donoso to a second "law," viz., that principles or theories develop logically to their conclusions and work out inevitably in social and political life independently of anyone's desires. Adhering to this law of causality, Donoso laid bare the connection between the Protestant Revolt and the rationalist society in which he lived. But at the same time he oversimplified the causal relationship by ignoring many other factors in the complexus of human relationships with which the historian should be concerned.

Donoso never fully repudiated certain laws he formulated from his study of Vico. He believed that humanity is subject to the same laws everywhere and at all times, and from this belief he seems to deduce that all human societies are subject to the same laws of historical development, of growth and decline. In 1837, e.g., he tells his audience that every society passes through two ages: an age of faith, the spontaneous age of youth; and an age of reason, the age of reflective maturity.[42] Again, in 1847, he explains that every people goes through a cycle of three epochs, which require three different types of government. These are the revolutionary, the transitionary, and the normal epochs, which in his age in Spain took the form of Espartero's revolutionary rule, the reign of Isabel II since she came of age, and the last or normal age, which had not begun in 1847.[43]

More important to Donoso for understanding history were two general laws of history which he deduced from theology and, he believed, verified from the evidence of history. Both laws, like Pope

[42] Fifth Lecture to the Madrid Ateneo, January 3, 1837, B.A.C., I, 259-260.
[43] Speech of March 4, 1847, on Spanish Foreign Relations, B.A.C., II, 60.

Pius IX's later declaration of the Immaculate Conception, were formulated against the popular opinion of the time. The first law asserted against the commonly held idea of progress that on the natural plane evil always triumphs over good and that societies are saved from inevitable perdition only by the supernatural action of God. Donoso attacked the idea of progress for erroneous views about the end, the beginning, and the course of history. It "is so far from being true," he asserted, "that society is obliged to draw back before arriving at the final limits of civilization in order not to fall into barbarism."[44] The generally accepted idea of progress held that man progressed through successive stages of savage, huntsman, nomadic shepherd, and settled farmer. Donoso was convinced that Genesis refuted such a theory of man's origin, for at the moment of creation God spoke to man, and Moses tells us infallibly that Cain was a farmer. Donoso believed that all history proves that man is not making progress toward a state of perfection such as the idea of progress holds out for the future. He emphasizes the absurdity of this idea by reducing it to this formula: "The human race will be perfect when it has denied God who is its divine bond; when it has denied government which is its political bond; when it has denied private property which is its social bond; and when it has denied the family which is its domestic bond."[45] Society is moving not toward perfection, he wrote in another place, but to its death.[46]

Donoso took the opposite—but equally extreme and equally historically justifiable—view that on the natural plane evil always triumphs over good. In a long letter to Montalembert, in which he attempts to show the Frenchman that one cannot be both Catholic and liberal, Donoso explains that the Deluge and the Crucifixion signify two things: "the natural triumph of evil over good, and the supernatural triumph of God over evil by means of direct, personal, sovereign action. . . . For me," he concludes, "such is philosophy, the complete philosophy of history."[47] In a letter written a month later Donoso repeated what he considered the "sovereign law of history," fallen man inevitably seeking evil and God miraculously saving him.

[44] "Pensamientos varios," B.A.C., II, 826. These were unpublished reflections which Tejado found among Donoso's effects.

[45] Letter of May 26, 1849, to Montalembert, B.A.C., II, 208.

[46] Letter of July 16, 1849, to the editors of *Pais* and *Heraldo*, B.A.C., II, 219.

[47] Letter of May 26, 1849, to Montalembert, B.A.C., II, 207.

There is my whole doctrine: the natural triumph of evil over good, and the supernatural triumph of God over evil. There is found the condemnation of all these systems of progress whereby modern philosophers, deceivers by profession, benumb the people, these children who will never emerge from their childhood.[48]

The second important "historical law" Donoso formulated against the liberals of his time is his law of sanctions. This law was stated in his speech on dictatorship which was translated immediately into all major European languages and admired by conservative-minded people in all countries. Donoso's study of history and his analysis of human nature led him to conclude that man needs strong authority to guide his weak intellect and to restrain his corrupted will. Fallen human nature must be kept under tight control.

There are only two possible forms of control: one is internal, the other is external; one is religious control, the other political control. They are of such a nature that when the religious barometer rises, the barometer of political control falls; and likewise when the religious barometer falls, the political barometer, that is political control and tyranny, rises. That is a law of humanity, a law of history.[49]

From his study of history and the laws he formulated Donoso passed judgment on his age and predicted an unhappy future for European civilization. His was the age, Donoso believed, in which the heresies of the past came to fruition in political and social institutions. The errors of his day, then, are theological in origin and in essence, but they are political and social in their application. Whereas they were formerly found in books alone, now they are found everywhere, "in books, in institutions, in the laws, in the journals, in speeches and conversations, in the salons and clubs, in the home and in public places, in whatever is said or done."[50]

Donoso believed that while error was legion in his day, every error could be reduced to denial of the providence of God and belief in the natural goodness of man. In logical, deductive fashion he demonstrates that one who holds these errors must end up an anarchist or a tyrant.[51] By means of a demonstration that was logical rather than

[48] Letter to the editors of *Pais* and *Heraldo*, B.A.C., II, 219.

[49] Speech of January 4, 1849, on dictatorship, B.A.C., II, 219.

[50] Letter of June 19, 1852, to Cardinal Fornari, B.A.C., II, 615.

[51] *Ibid.*, II, 615-616. This same statement is to be found in his letter to the editors of *Pais* and *Heraldo*, B.A.C., II, 216.

historical Donoso drew up a picture of two civilizations, the "philosophical" civilization which was based on heresy, and the Catholic civilization which was based on revealed truth.

> Between these two civilizations [he wrote to Montalembert] there is an unbridgeable chasm, and absolute antagonism. . . . The one is error, the other is truth; the one is evil, the other is good. Between them one must make the supreme choice, and, this choice made, proclaim the one and condemn the other completely and without reserve. Those who fluctuate between the two [Montalembert, de Broglie and their associates], those who accept the principles of the one and the consequences of the other, the eclectics, men of small minds, are condemned irretrievably to absurdity.[52]

Donoso believed that the "philosophic" civilization, in which "the tree of error has arrived at its maturity,"[53] had come to full realization in his day. He seems to have believed in 1849 that the uprisings of the past year would be repeated on a larger scale and that the Metternichian system was doomed to immediate destruction throughout Europe. Western civilization was on the eve of the "greatest catastrophe of history. For the moment, what I see most clearly is the barbarization of Europe and before long its depopulation."[54] "Tomorrow will be a period of anguish; all the symptoms indicate it: blindness of mind, animosity of spirit, arguments without object, battles without motive, but above all—I will doubtless astonish many of the Assembly—the furor of economic reform."[55]

That is the key to the nature of the crisis. Liberals and socialists had alike forgotten the purpose of life. Heretics as regards God and man, they cannot understand the elementary laws of political and social life. They believe that man is self-sufficient, that he can live the good life without the help of grace, and they consider the good life a life of material pleasure. Donoso, therefore, condemned his age for the very reasons that his contemporaries exalted it. "It is an age of utilitarian systems, of great developments in commerce, of feverish activity in industry, an age characterized by the insolence of the rich

[52] Letter of May 26, 1849, to Montalembert, B.A.C., II, 207.

[53] Letter to Cardinal Fornari, B.A.C., II, 614.

[54] Letter of August 24, 1849, to Monsignor Gaume, B.A.C., II, 228.

[55] Address of January 30, 1850, on "The General Situation of Europe," B.A.C., II, 299.

and the impatience of the poor."[56] It was an age in which right order was overturned because heresy was transferred from religion to social life, from books to institutions, and thus first place was given to economic and social questions which were not of primary importance.

Donoso thought he lived in an age of indecision before Europe plunged into the dark night of socialism. It was an age of indecision because the liberals were in control, and they were by nature a party of indecision, the group that hesitated to accept the logical conclusions to which their premises must some day be reduced. It was an age of middle class rule. By revolution this class had come to power, and by revolution it was to fall. "Revolution," he wrote in 1851, "has been made by the rich and for the rich. . . . By the restricted vote they have relegated the poor to a political and social limbo; by the parliamentary prerogative they have usurped the power of the crown."[57] He held the middle class in low repute.

> This middle class which today rules in Europe completely lacks the two qualities which alone render government possible: they have neither the gift of commanding nor the virtue of obeying, and, not knowing how to command those who obey or how to obey those who command, they only agitate society. . . . All peoples over whom this class rules oscillate perpetually between dictatorship, the remedy of anarchy, and anarchy, the remedy of dictatorship.[58]

It is a class incapable of ruling because it has no faith in itself, nor does it believe in any kind of absolute truth. Accepting a kind of relativism in all things, it is perforce a temporary phenomenon as a ruling class. "It is condemned, without knowing it, to embark on the ship whose fortune carries it to the Catholic port, or to the socialist reefs."[59]

In Donoso's opinion his was an age of "cold war."

> The world stands at the limits of two great things: peace and war. It is not at peace, for its spirits are at battle; it is not at war, for its arms are tranquil; it is in a permanent state of discord and dispute, a peace

---

[56] Letter to Cardinal Fornari, B.A.C., II, 618.

[57] Letter of November 26, 1851, to Maria Cristina, B.A.C., II, 599.

[58] Despatch to his government from Paris, where Donoso resided as Spanish ambassador from 1851 until his death in 1853. This letter is dated December 10, 1851, B.A.C., II, 709.

[59] *Ensayo*, B.A.C., II, 446.

unworthy of men, truly a war of women. It lacks the unchanging quietude of spirit necessary for a dignified peace, and it lacks the blood required for a fruitful and expiatory war.[60]

This is the state of indecision that precedes a general collapse of European society. Donoso insisted vehemently in his last years that Europe was lost. "Our nation is completely lost," he wrote to Tejado in 1851. "Liberalism and parliamentarianism produce the same effects: this system has come into the world for the punishment of the world; it will kill everything, patriotism, intelligence, morality, honor; it is evil, pure evil, substantial and essential evil."[61] "Yes," he wrote a month later, "our country is lost, entirely lost, lost without remedy; and Europe has no better hope of safety."[62] Society was lost, Donoso believed, because, unlike individual persons, it enjoys no afterlife. It must be punished for its sins in this world. Individuals can be saved, but not society. It is lost because it has cut itself away from the source of life and truth. Its institutions are no longer vivified by the Catholic spirit. They are, therefore, condemned to death.[63]

Donoso repeatedly denied that social or political reforms could accomplish any lasting good. Compromise between truth and error, between the Catholic civilization and the society of his age, was impossible. Liberal Catholics like de Broglie are deluded, he insists, in proposing an alliance between Catholicism and the liberal society of the nineteenth century. "Their illusion comes from two errors: the first is to believe that, for the sake of unity, Catholicism and liberty need treaties and alliances; the second is to imagine that the existing civilization and liberty are the same thing."[64] Wherever Catholicism is dominant, he maintains, people enjoy true liberty, and what is called liberty in his day is really revolution. Donoso admits that such people as de Broglie, who want to effect a reconciliation between their age and their religion, are noble souls. "But I insist," he adds, "that these noble leaders of a noble cause, in demanding liberty demand

[60] Letter to the editor of the *Revue des deux mondes*, B.A.C., II, 646.

[61] Letter of April 19, 1851, to Tejado, B.A.C., II, 576. Tejado apparently grouped several short letters together and put them all under one date and listed them as "letters to a friend." The B.A.C. edition separates these letters and identifies the friend as Tejado.

[62] Letter of May 15, 1851, to Tejado, in Veuillot, *op. cit.*, II, 149.

[63] Letter to the editors of *Pais* and *Heraldo*, B.A.C., II, 223.

[64] Letter to the editor of the *Revue des deux mondes*, B.A.C., II, 643.

from the present civilization precisely what is repugnant to it, and from their age what their age is not able to give."[65]

Donoso, therefore, offered his age a simple choice: that of returning to the Catholic faith and reforming society by reforming the individuals who make it up, or the alternative of rushing headlong to destruction. He saw no reason for expecting a return to Catholic living. In his speech on dictatorship he told the Spanish Assembly:

> The way is prepared for a gigantic tyrant, colossal, universal, immense. Note it well. There is no longer any physical resistance: the steamships and railroads have demolished frontiers, and the telegraph has demolished distance. There is no longer any moral resistance; all spirits are divided, all patriotism is dead.[66]

This new tyranny is identified with pagan socialism. It is the logical result of the Protestant Revolt and its resultant rationalistic civilization. It is made more terrible by the centralization and the craze for uniformity—of penal codes, customs, administration, language, and all phases of life—that Donoso sees all about him.[67]

Although Donoso frequently deals with liberalism and socialism in his various articles and speeches, it is chiefly in the *Ensayo* that he treats the two subjects systematically and analyzes their interrelationships. He considers liberalism a transitional state, both in doctrine and in institutions, between the Catholic civilization of the past and the socialist state of the future. "The Liberal School, enemy at once of the darkness and of the light, has selected I know not what twilight between the luminous and dark regions, between the eternal shades and the divine aurora."[68] Liberalism and socialism are children of the same parent, rationalism, and they "differ not in ideas but in daring."[69]

Donoso respects socialists for going to the heart of the matter, for having the courage to reduce liberal premises to their logical conclusions, and for daring to make bold affirmations.[70] "Being essentially

[65] *Ibid.*

[66] Speech of January 4, 1849, B.A.C., II, 201.

[67] "Pensamientos varios," B.A.C., II, 824.

[68] *Ensayo,* B.A.C., II, 449.

[69] *Ibid.,* II, 496.

[70] Donoso must have felt a personal repugnance for liberals that he did not feel for socialists. In his last years he always refers to liberals in general terms,

theological," he writes of the socialists, "they measure the abysses in all their profundity, and they are not wanting a certain grandeur in their manner of proposing the problems and solving them."[71] Liberals, on the other hand, discuss and distinguish everything in order to avoid any radical commitments—which lead inevitably to Catholicism or socialism.

> Of all the schools this [the Liberal School] is the most sterile, because the least learned and the most egotistical. As we have seen, it knows nothing of the nature of good or evil; it has scarcely any notion of God, and it has no notion of man whatever. Impotent for good, because devoid of all dogmatic affirmation, and for evil, because all intrepid and absolute negation horrifies it, it is condemned, without knowing it, to embark in the ship whose fortune carries it to the Catholic port, or to the socialist reefs.[72]

Looking back through history, Donoso finds that liberals prevail for only short periods of time, the fleeting moment when the crowd teeters doubtfully between Christ and Barrabas. While in this state of indecision society allows the liberal school to preside over the melee—a transitory role which it assumes with detached aloofness, contributing neither affirmations nor denials to the argument but simply quibbling until the disputants reach a verdict. By means of discussion they confound all issues and create skepticism. But eventually, Donoso claims, a verdict is reached and the liberal is forced to abdicate. He expected the triumph of socialism within his own lifetime, a triumph that would be won by battle not against liberals but against the Catholic Church in Europe. For on the day of battle the remaining liberals, long on discussion and compromise but short on courage and conviction, will have fled the field. By that time, Donoso believed, most liberals will have become socialists or returned to Catholicism.

Donoso's theory of history led him to make pessimistic predictions about the future of Europe. Because he believed that everything is at bottom theological, and because he believed that ideas ultimately worked out in social and political institutions, he insisted that socialism was inevitable—unless, of course, God should intervene providentially

---

never quoting one or citing one by name; whereas he quotes socialists by name and work. Liberal thought, with its constant distinctions and its hesitating conclusions, must have appeared effeminate to this Spaniard who in temper and manner of thinking was much closer akin to the socialists.

[71] *Ensayo*, B.A.C., II, 468.

[72] *Ibid.*, II, 446.

and lead Europeans back to the truth and into the Church. Dictatorship can halt the process temporarily but never permanently. The process will go on. In 1839 he conceded that "the inflexible logic of principles is limited by the inconsequence of men and the good sense of the people—which cannot, however, prevent their eventual working out."[73] And in the last year of his life he reassures friends from time to time that his predictions will ultimately prove correct. "According to the natural order of things," he wrote to the Spanish foreign office from his embassy in Paris, "everything should happen as I have announced it would."[74] But, he hastened to add, many things can intervene in the natural order of things: a rebellion in the army, a bold individual's *coup*, a sudden change of opinion, or perhaps someone's getting sick.

Donoso Cortés has been called "a prophet of Europe's disasters" because he predicted the general line of development that European society followed after his death, and more particularly because of his predictions about Russia's future role in world history. In his speech of 1850 on the general situation of Europe he predicted that in the near future "the clock of time will chime the hour of Russia, when Russia will be able to walk, armed and unopposed, across our country."[75] This hour will have arrived, he told the Spanish Assembly,

> when there are no longer any standing armies in Europe, when they have been disbanded by revolutions, when there is no longer any patriotism in Europe, the socialist revolutions having stifled it, when, in Eastern Europe the great confederation of the Slavonic races is an accomplished fact, and when in the West there are but two armies, that of the despoiled and that of the despoilers.[76]

Closer examination of Donoso's analysis of Russia's future shows that he missed the mark more than his admirers admit. He believed

[73] "Intervención de pueble en la imposición de contribuciones," B.A.C., I, 656-657.

[74] Despatch of December 15, 1852, from Paris, B.A.C., II, 742.

Donoso was remarkably accurate in predicting political developments in France. He seems to have understood how the Second Republic lacked any solid backing and how Louis Napoleon Bonaparte would take advantage of the situation. He predicted Napoleon III's *coup* to the exact day, and there is no evidence that he had advance information about it when he sent his dispatch to the Spanish foreign office.

[75] Speech of January 30, 1850, B.A.C., II, 311.

[76] *Ibid.*

that Russia would rush into the vacuum created by revolutions in Europe because Russia alone would still be strong.[77] At least in his speech of 1850 he foresees no political or social change in tsarist Russia. His study of Russia in 1839, in a series of articles on the Eastern Question, is a more accurate analysis of Russia's place in modern history than his later analysis of 1850. Quoting de Bonald to the effect that this semi-barbarous people is destined to do great things in the world, he goes on to observe that the most striking thing about Russia is "its irresistible force of expansion."[78] He remarked: "Russia makes war in order to conquer, and wins victories in order to protect the conquered. When the conquered takes the title of ally of Russia, it becomes her victim, her prey. The victories of Russia lead to her protection, her protection leads to death."[79]

What is to be said by way of evaluation about Donoso Cortés' view of history and his criticism of his age? We should remember he was neither a professional theologian[80] nor a professional historian, but he used both theology and history to formulate a working philosophy of history on the basis of which he analyzed the historical position of his age. He was a polemicist[81] in everything he said or wrote. As a polemicist he overstated his position against his opponents. Against the devotees of progress he asserted that Europe was heading

[77] Donoso does concede in this speech that England might be able to save Europe from Russia, for England is generous, courageous, and even less exposed to revolution than Russia. "But," he adds, "for the palliative to become truly a remedy, it is necessary that England, already conservative and monarchical, become Catholic. I can assert this because against revolution and socialism there is only one radical and sovereign remedy: Catholicism, the sole doctrine which is an absolute contradiction of revolutionary and socialist doctrine."

[78] "Antecedentes sobre la cuestión de Oriente," B.A.C., I, 614.

[79] *Ibid.*, I, 615.

[80] During the discussion in European papers about his *Ensayo*, Donoso protested to Louis Veuillot: "I have already told you and I repeat it, I am profoundly ignorant of the science of theology. I have never studied it; I am not a scholar."—Veuillot, *op. cit.*, II, 207.

[81] Personally, Donoso abhorred discussion or argument of any kind. ("Discussion is the title under which Death travels when he seeks to avoid recognition and goes incognito."—*Ensayo*, B.A.C., II, 447.) Nevertheless, he was a polemicist. He simply stated his arguments as clearly and strongly as possible, reducing his opponents' arguments to what he thought were logical conclusions without reference to any objections they might make against his line of reasoning.

to destruction; against the followers of Rousseau he asserted that man's will is naturally inclined to evil and his intellect to error;[82] against the liberals he held that their doctrines lead inevitably to socialism; against secular thinkers he asserted that he who is ignorant of theology knows nothing. As a result, Donoso's writings are full of extreme statements that cannot stand of themselves. They must be read in the context of his full body of writing, and they must be interpreted in the setting of the liberal and socialist writers against whom they were directed. Both Donoso and his supporters complained when his texts were taken apart and analyzed phrase by phrase. Moreover, Donoso always showed himself willing to retract or rephrase whatever competent theologians thought was in error or in need of different phrasing. Even with these considerations in mind, however, one must conclude today that Donoso's view of man was dangerously close to the views condemned by the Council of Trent. His extreme statements were not successfully challenged, we can believe, because most Catholics of his time were interested mainly in taking a strong stand against the common enemy of liberalism.

Donoso must be admired for his courage in jousting with the popular thinkers of his age, but it must be admitted that he handled difficult theological and social doctrines with more zeal than prudence. The fact that he was writing for a general audience does not of itself excuse him from the charges made against him by the liberal French Catholics, as most of his defenders claimed.[83] His zeal and enthusiasm led him to suggest that a special condemnation should be made of the social and political doctrines of the time which, he insisted,

[82] "Prevaricating and fallen man was not made for the truth, nor was truth made for prevaricating and fallen man. Between truth and human reason, after the prevarication, God established a lasting repugnance and an invincible repulsion. . . . Between human reason and the absurd there is a secret affinity and a close relationship."—*Ensayo*, B.A.C., II, 379.

[83] Donoso appreciated this fact. In his letter to Pope Pius IX he suggested that the *Ensayo* should be judged as to content of doctrine and as to form of expression.

Abbé Gaduel's criticism of the *Ensayo* can be boiled down to these points: 1) Donoso's idea of God diminishes human liberty unduly; 2) he does not use rigorously correct language in speaking of the Trinity; 3) he confuses the perfect liberty in God with human liberty; 4) his view of original sin does not give God His infinite perfections; 5) he overstresses the effects of original sin; 6) his treatment of the motives of credibility for the Catholic faith is faulty.

were only the old heresies in new guise.[84] Like other Catholics of the time, he seems to have had some sort of syllabus of errors in mind, something similar to what Pope Pius IX published a decade later.

Like the better known Louis Veuillot, Donoso Cortés is important for his penetrating criticism of the liberal and socialist thought of his time. His insight was remarkable, and in a general way he predicted the future of both movements because he measured them by more than an economic yardstick. Goetz Briefs maintains:

> It is Donoso's great achievement—in fact he is the first writer to be credited with it—to have measured both movements with the yardstick of Catholic doctrine and to have revealed their shortcomings, their destructive character, their incompatibility with man's nature and the nature of human society. . . . It is our opinion, that Donoso Cortés is one of those rare thinkers, who foresaw the trend of the times and warned of the dangers that lay ahead of the age.[85]

As a prophet Donoso Cortés had similar strengths and weaknesses to those of Karl Marx. Both men made independent and penetrating criticisms of their age. Both insisted that it was a transitional stage on the way to socialism. Both men believed the revolution was imminent, for both of them seem to have believed that men logically and rationally follow out in practice the theories which they hold in the abstract. Like Marx, Donoso thought that the liberal society would work out its principles even while it brought the roof of revolution toppling down on its head. He seems not to have envisaged the possibility of such concessions as those made later in the nineteenth century, nor would he have considered them as more than temporary obstacles to the inevitable working out of the process of destruction.

French liberal Catholics were, therefore, basically wrong, in Donoso's opinion, in trying to work out an amalgam between their age and their faith. Donoso belonged to the conservative wing of Catholic thought in the mid-nineteenth century, and his influence was considerable in these circles. Some of his speeches and his *Ensayo* were translated into all the western languages, and even in this country he was hailed by Orestes Brownson as an outstanding

[84] Donoso deals with this question in his letter to Cardinal Fornari, B.A.C., II, 613 *passim*.

[85] *A Christian Statesman and Political Philosopher*, pp. 21-22, 23.

defender of Christianity against what Brownson termed "the advancing tide of infidelity and barbarism."[86]

Time and the evidence of history show us that Donoso Cortés made that mistake, so common to polemicists and orators, of painting his pictures too exclusively in black and white. To him the liberal and the socialist were completely black, pure evil. The Catholic was completely white, pure good. He tended to identify the man with the ideology in all three "isms." In denying any redeeming quality or any measure of truth to these secular heresies he did individual liberals and socialists a measure of injustice. Moreover, by oversimplifying the issues of his time he did truth a certain injustice.

His shortcomings, however, are the counterpart of his strength. By painting in black and white Donoso revealed the essential defects in both liberalism and socialism, and he showed us that western civilization rests ultimately not on social and political grounds, but on a religious basis. This he did at a time when few men had the insight and the courage to say that society was not progressing to a state of perfection that could be reached in time within the historical process. For this reason he is important historically.

Saint Louis University

[86] "Church and State," *Catholic World*, V (April, 1867), 1. In his review of the English translation of the *Ensayo*, Brownson observes of Donoso: "Among the noble and brave men who then [in 1848-1849] placed themselves on the side of religion and society, of faith and Christian civilization, and attempted to stay the advancing tide of infidelity and barbarism, few were more conspicuous, or did more to stir up men's minds and hearts to a sense of the danger, than the learned, earnest Donoso Cortés, Marquis of Valdegamas." Brownson calls the *Ensayo* "the most eloquent book we ever read."

MOSCOW THE THIRD ROME: GENESIS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF A POLITICO-RELIGIOUS IDEA

By

Cyril Toumanoff*

By the end of the fifteenth century, a door was shut upon the past when Constantinople fell, and others opened on to the future with the discovery of America and the rise of Muscovite Russia. On her way toward becoming a great power, Muscovy evolved a politico-religious ideology of her own which marked her coming of age and her emancipation from foreign tutelage. This ideology was grounded in the claim that Moscow was the "Third Rome" and, as such, a successor to the political and religious position both of Constantinople, the "Second Rome," and of true Rome. The literature dealing with the exposition of this idea, especially by the monk Philotheus, its literary and textual filiation, and its connection with the political realities of rising Muscovy is quite considerable.[1] The purpose of this study is to trace the genealogy of the idea itself, rather than of its

* The author is assistant professor of history in Georgetown University. This paper, in a substantially identical form, was read at the joint meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association and the American Historical Association, Washington, December 29, 1952.

[1] Cf. *inter alia*, M. D'jakonov, *Vlast' moskovskix gosudarej* (St. Petersburg, 1889); V. Malinin, *Starec Eleazarova monastyrja Filofej i ego poslanija* (Kiev, 1901), which contains an edition of Philotheus' writings; I. Kirillov, *Tretij Rim* (Moscow, 1914); V. Val'denberg, *Drevnerusskie učenija o predelax carskoj vlasti* (Petrograd, 1916); H. Schaeder, *Moskau das dritte Rom* (Osteuropäische Studien, I [1929]); N. Čaev, "Moskva—tretij Rim v političeskoj praktike moskovskogo pravitel'stva XVI-go veka," *Istoričeskie Zapiski*, XVII (1945); G. Olšr, S.J., "Gli ultimi Rurikidi e le basi ideologiche della sovranità dello Stato russo," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, XII (1946); C. Toumanoff, "Caesaropapism in Byzantium and Russia," *Theological Studies*, VII (1946); E. Denissoff, "Aux origines de l'Eglise russe autocéphale," *Revue des études slaves*, XXI (1947); D. Obolensky, "Russia's Byzantine Heritage," *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, V (1950); O. Oglobin, *Moskovs'ka teorija III Rimu* (Munich, 1951); W. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome* (Geneva, 1952), cf. my review in *Journal of Modern History*, XXV (1953), 419-420; D. Strémooukhoff, "Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine," *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953).

exposition, in context with the vaster, and congeneric, phenomenon of Byzantine Christianity.

The third unit of any real or spurious series offers something aesthetically satisfying and dialectically final, as well as partaking of religious symbolism—something which has appealed to some contemporaries of Abbot Joachim no less than to those of Adolf Hitler. There were, however, other reasons, more particular and more profound, why the idea that the capital of Muscovite Russia was the "Third Rome" fired the imagination of the Russians. To begin with, this theory asserted Russia's independence of Constantinople; it, then, brought to a logical conclusion and into context with historical events the several traditions which Constantinople had transmitted to Russia; finally, it proved a potent anodyne for her humiliations of the past. Russia, indeed, had heretofore been a spiritual client of Byzantium and—more humiliating still—a subject of the Mongol Golden Horde. But in the fifteenth century she overthrew Mongol overlordship and achieved her spiritual independence of Byzantium. The one liberation was wrought by force of arms; the other, through the birth of an idea. The material success gave substance to the spiritual presumption, and the latter served to assuage the memory of past subjections.

The potency of this ideology derived from its affirmation. Instead of denying the past, it incorporated it with the present. Exactly as the overthrow of Mongol suzerainty did not mean the end of Mongol influence in Russia, but rather signified the continuation of the Golden Horde in Muscovy with the czar as the successor to the Mongol imperial idea, so also the theory of Moscow the Third Rome was a fabric woven with Byzantine threads, and it only denied Constantinople's supremacy by asserting Moscow's succession to it.

Forming part of the Byzantine religious complex, these threads reach far back into history. It is through them that pre-Petrine Russia, informed by that complex, could claim a contact with classical antiquity—a contact that is often overlooked. The idea of Moscow the Third Rome was, indeed, a Roman heritage. Byzantium was the mediaeval survival of the eastern half of the *pax romana*, of the cultural syncretism of the Mediterranean world within the framework of the Roman polity. And, as Hegel noted, while in the empire's western half the barbarian invasions helped to obliterate pagan Roman traditions and to replace them with new, Christian, conceptions, the

Eastern Empire retained unimpaired those pre-Christian traditions.[2] These, along with their ideological progeny, were subsequently transmitted by Byzantium to its spiritual dependency of Russia.

Christianity introduced in the world wholly novel principles. Obeying the words of Our Lord "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God the things that are God's" (*Matt.* 22:21 and parallel texts) and in context with His universal message, it postulated a correlation of the spiritual and the temporal power on the basis of the primacy, independence, and universality of the spiritual. Man, according to the Christian view, belongs to two distinct societies which exist for his welfare: the spiritual society of the Church, which is of its nature one and universal, and the temporal society of the State, which may assume a variety of forms. All this makes for what can be termed Christian "societal dualism."[3]

This new conception did not fail to clash with the "societal monism" implied in the pagan Roman State. Found in all non-Christian communities—and subsequently among some Christian groups as well—societal monism admits of but one society, in which the polity is the *raison d'être* of both religion and man. If unchecked, societal monism conduces to the absolute State, and, further still, to the fusion of the spiritual and the temporal and to the divinization of the latter power. As the Roman emperors between Augustus and Diocletian tended to transform their position of chief magistrates into that of Hellenistic monarchs, the local Roman aspect of this extreme monism, that of the deifying State, was enhanced by the corresponding Hellenistic aspect of the divine king. Thus the Roman Empire presumed to subordinate to the temporal, not only the spiritual, but also—no matter how diluted the notion of it—the divine.[4]

[2] *Philosophy of History*, Part III, Chap. iii, Sec. 3, trans. J. Sibree (New York, 1944), pp. 337 f.

[3] Cf., e.g., J. Lecler, *The Two Sovereignties* (London, 1952), Engl. trans. of *L'Eglise et la souveraineté de l'Etat* (Paris, 1946); *Church and State: Papers read at the Summer School of Catholic Studies, held at Cambridge, July 27th to August 6th, 1935* (London, 1936), esp. I: "The New Testament and the Pagan Emperors" by C. Lattey, S.J., pp. 1-28; J. Maritain, *Primauté du spirituel* (Paris, 1927); H. Rommen, *The State in Catholic Thought* (St. Louis/London, 1945), esp. Part III, 507-612; to this should be added Vladimir Solov'ëv's profound book, *La Russie et l'Eglise universelle* (Paris, 1889; Engl. trans. H. Rees, London, 1948). This dualism is, of course, distinct from Catholic pluralism in the temporal order, for which see Rommen, esp. pp. 143-145.

[4] Cf. E. Peterson, *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem* (Leipzig, 1935); L. R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown,

A conflict between the imperial Roman and the Christian conception was unavoidable. When it flared up, it took the form, inevitable in the circumstances, of the persecutions to which, between Nero and Licinius, the Church was sporadically subjected.[5] In the face of such trials, however, the Church refused to accept a *simpliste* solution. Her attitude was marked by a polarity born of the distinction drawn between the "Babylonian" iniquity of monism (*Apoc.;* cf. *I Peter* 5:13) and the lawfulness and dignity of civil authority as derived from God (*Rom.* 13:1-17; *I Tim.* 2:2; *Titus* 3:1-2; *I Peter* 2:13-17; stemming, of course, from *John* 19:11 and *Matt.* 22:21).[6]

Conn., 1931); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen* (Leipzig, 1923); G. Herzog-Hauser, "Kaiserkult," Pauly, Wissowa, Kroll, *Real-Encycl.der class.Altertumswiss.*, Supplementb. IV (1924), 806-853; H. Leclercq, "Empereurs," *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, IV, 2 (1921), esp. 2730-2751.—The phenomenon of societal monism has no necessary connection with what form the civil government of a given society may assume: a republic may be monistic and a monarchy may not, though monistic monarchy will tend to absolutism and an absolutist monarchy towards monism (as witness, e.g., the conjunction of the "grande monarchie" with Gallicanism). The Christian objection to monism is double: (1) because it denies the primacy of the spiritual, determining the greater by the less, and (2) because it denies societal dualism and, in its extreme form, destroys it. Most usually monism implies that in the *one* society the spiritual is subordinate to the temporal. Its converse is genuine theocracy (cf. *infra*, n. 14), such as is found in Tibet; the supremacy of the spiritual in it is, however, only apparent: not being universal, the spiritual-temporal complex is determined by national-political factors.

[5] For the Persecutions see, e.g., J. Zeiller, in A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, I (Paris, 1946), 289-297, 299-320; II (Paris, 1948), 113-122, 145-160, 457-479.—Christian religious exclusiveness (and consequent refusal to participate in the Emperor-worship) was the more apparent reason for the Persecutions; but, then, Jewish exclusiveness (and refusal) was tolerated. Judaism, too, was monistic: a religion confined to, i.e., determinable by, a nation, in which the spiritual and the temporal were often nearly fused in a theocracy. By its very nature, however, Jewish monism was precluded from attaining the extreme form of the divinized State.

[6] Thus, St. Paul shows a certain pride in being a Roman citizen (*Acts*, 22:25-27) and a respect for the Empire's law and order (*Acts*, 16:37, 38; 25:16). The Church refused to compromise with the Emperor-worship, but she prayed for the Emperors, as she has since done for any lawful civil authority; cf. Leclerq, *art. cit.*, col. 2753-2755; G. Tellenbach, *Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke in der Liturgie des frühen Mittelalters* (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philos.-hist. Kl. [1934-1935], i);

Then—we know—the situation changed abruptly. Constantine granted toleration to Christianity; later, Theodosius made Catholicism the established religion of the State. The Roman State, the persecutor of yesterday, was thrust into its former victim's fold. To many Christians it seemed that the empire had been predestined to pave the way for the Church and now to become her temporal protector—Babylon in the service of Sion.[7] Yet abrupt changes are seldom thorough changes. The conversion of individuals, imperfect in many cases—and of this the clinic case of the "Thirteenth Apostle" himself is almost an archetype—did not transform the pagan essence of that State. And that essence still commanded the adherence of the great numbers of the imperfectly Christianized. This continuance of societal monism in the Christianized empire shattered the roseate dream of a harmonious, dualistic, co-existence of Church and State. So, after a moment of the Church's stunned and hopeful silence under the first Christian emperor, the old struggle of Christian dualism and pagan monism was resumed.[8]

L. Biehl, *Das liturgische Gebet für Kaiser und Reich, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Verhältnisses von Kirche und Staat* (*Görres-Gesellschaft zur Pflege der Wissenschaften im katholischen Deutschland. Veröffentlichungen d. Sektion für Rechts- u. Sozialwiss.*, LXXV [Paderborn, 1937]). The Church's injunction to pray for and to obey lawful civil authority begins with Sts. Peter, Paul, and Clement I (*Ep. ad Corinth.*, 61: 1). The hope of transforming the *pax romana* into a *pax christiana* was, no doubt, the reason why some ante-Nicene Fathers interpreted the Adversary's "withholder" (*τὸ κατέχον, ὁ κατέχων*) of *II Thess.* 2:6-7 as the Roman Empire (cf. O. Buzy and A. Brunot, "Thessaloniciens (Epitres aux)," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XV [1946], 600-607.—There is no opposition between the above two attitudes of the Church (so Strémooukhoff, *Moscow the Third Rome*, p. 84), but merely a fine distinction (for which see also C. Dawson, in *A Monument to Saint Augustine* [New York, 1930], pp. 24-25) between Rome's two faces: the "Beast" and the *pax romana*.

[7] Cf. E. Gilson's Foreword to *Saint Augustine: The City of God*, trans. D. Zema, S.J., and G. Walsh, S.J. (*The Fathers of the Church*, VIII [New York, 1950]), pp. xxxiv-xxxviii.—It was hoped—in vain—that, with the conversion, Babylon would vanish and only the "peace" would remain. So long, however, as the Empire subsisted, its two manifestations proved inseparable, and the former the basic one.

[8] Cf. J.-R. Palanque, in Fliche-Martin, III (Paris, 1947), 62-65, 523-524; K. Setton, *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century* (New York, 1941), pp. 54, 78-108.—The utter novelty of the situation, the parallelism with Old Israel's monism, and—not least—Constantine's "Augustan

It was now waged *within* Christian society, especially in the *partes Orientis* where, safe from the fate of the West and clinging to the unchanging political tradition of Rome and cultural tradition of Hellenism, the ill-converted empire proved sufficiently vigorous to survive for a millennium.[9] This struggle was carried on between two contrary trends. One was the old repulsion of the Christian and the pagan tradition; the other, the novel attempt to conciliate them. This trend of appeasement (as we may call it) accepted the pagan imperial inheritance and strove to veneer it with a Christian coating.[10] These pathetic attempts to conciliate the irreconcilable make us realize, not without an admixture of pity, to what an extent the Byzantines found themselves helpless before the temptation of choosing the road of

---

wiliness" (Setton, p. 54) must have contributed to the Church's—New Israel's—momentary silence at the time when the failure of the expected harmonious symbiosis of Babylon and Jerusalem was beginning to be obvious. The Church's awakening to the dangers of the imperfectly-converted *imperium* can hardly be taken to signify that "the *sacerdotium* was elevated to a higher dignity than the *imperium* towards the last quarter of the fourth century" (Setton, p. 108). This hierarchy of values stems from that implied in the juxtaposition of "God" and "Caesar" in *Matt.* 22:21.

[9] For this survival see N. H. Baynes, *The Hellenistic Civilization and East Rome* (London, 1946); "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales,* II (Mélanges Bidez), 1934, 13-18; L. Bréhier, *Les institutions de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris, 1949), Bk. I, pp. 1-88, also 89-90; E. Stein, "Introduction à l'histoire et aux institutions byzantines," *Traditio,* VII (1949-1951), 96, 97, 138-139.

[10] The manifestations of the two opposite currents in Byzantine Christianity will be found in M. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin* (Paris, 1941), Chaps. I and II, pp. 3-100. The difference between them was symptomized by the contrast between St. Augustine and Eusebius of Caesarea; cf. F. E. Cranz, *"De Civitate Dei,* XV, 2, and Augustine's Idea of the Christian Society," *Speculum,* XXV (1950), esp. p. 221. To the appeasement trend the fiasco of the attempted Babylon-Jerusalem symbiosis was inadmissible; to them, in fact, surviving Babylon *was* New Israel. For traces of this Byzantine "Neo-Hierosolymism" see, e.g., A. Grabar, "L'art religieux et l'empire byzantin à l'époque des Macédoniens," *Annuaire de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes,* 1939-1940, p. 35; cf. the so-called "Letter of Photius to Zacharias of Armenia," ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik,* XXXI (1892), 183-186; Russ. trans. N. Marr, *ibid.,* pp. 231-235. For Photius' spurious authorship of this Armenian document see G. Garitte, *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae* (*Corpus Script. Christ. Orient.,* CXXXII, Subsidia, IV [Louvain, 1952]), pp. 370-375; and my art. "Christian Caucasia between Byzantium and Iran: New Light from Old Sources," *Traditio,* X (1954), § 2.

least resistance in a world so overwhelmingly un-Christian, and before their own attachment to its works and pomps.

The Roman imperial inheritance of societal monism, when projected into a Christian society, affected the correlation of the spiritual and the temporal in a way utterly at variance with Christian principles. Of this anomalous correlation, "caesaropapism" is still the best description. The term has been defined as the tendency to determine the spiritual by the temporal;[11] thus understood, it can successfully withstand the recent attempts to dismiss it.[12] At all events, few will deny that the tendency denoted by that term was endemic in Byzantine society; and that the emperors, who embodied the monistic temporal power, acted, *de facto* if not always *de jure*, as heads of the Church in their realm. Byzantine religious history is replete with incessant imperial exercise of the purely papal functions of the supreme ruler, teacher, and center of unity in Byzantine Christianity.[13] In a word, Caesar, once the *pontifex maximus*, now would be pope.

The fusion of the two powers was thus the logical culmination of the tendency to determine the spiritual by the temporal; in recent literature it has been rather euphemistically designated as "theoc-

[11] Toumanoff, *Caesaropapism*, pp. 213-215.

[12] The problem of caesaropapism and of its negation is dealt with in some detail in my *Christian Caucasia*, § 6-7.

[13] The recent literature on this subject is discussed in F. Dölger and A. Schneider, *Byzanz* (*Wissenschaftliche Forschungsberichte*, Geisteswiss. Reihe herausg. v. Prof. Dr. Karl Hönn, V [Bern, 1952]), pp. 93-100. See also, e.g., G. H. Williams, "Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century," *Church History*, XX (1951); Bréhier, *Institutions*, pp. 1-90, 430-442; A. N. Diomedes, Πηγὴ καὶ ἔκτασις τῆς αὐτοκρατορικῆς ἐξουσίας εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον, *Byzantina-Metabyzantina*, I, 2 (1949); H. Berkhof, *Kirche und Kaiser. Eine Untersuchung der Entstehung der byzantinischen und der theokratischen Staatsauffassung im vierten Jahrhundert*, trans. from the Dutch by G. W. Locher (Zurich, 1947); G. Kittel, *Christus und Imperator* (Stuttgart/Berlin, 1939); O. Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell* (Jena, 1938); A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin* (Paris, 1936); N. Suvorov, *Učebnik cerkovnago prava* (Moscow, 1913), pp. 39-44, 462-469.—This inherence of societal monism was one *de facto* only so long as Byzantine Christianity remained within the unity of the Catholic Church; it can only be said to have become one *de jure* after the final separation of the one from the other—through acceptance by Byzantine canonists; cf. *infra*, n. 34. This is a distinction seldom made in the literature of the subject.

racy."[14] Another extreme form of societal monism, the divinization of the State, also formed part of the Romano-Hellenistic tradition received by the Byzantines. Quite obviously, the Christianized temporal power could no longer openly assert its divinity, yet it did so covertly, under claims to an especially sacred character; to base, however, such claims on the Christian teaching regarding the origin and dignity of all civil authority was a flagrant *non sequitur*.[15] Likewise, the brief apparent co-extension of empire and Christendom

[14] Cf., e.g., Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, esp. pp. 24, 30 ("theocracy, in which the secular authority remained [rests] supreme"); A. Schmemann, "La théocratie byzantine et l'Eglise orthodoxe," *Dieu Vivant*, XXV (1953), 35-53, where "theocracy," conceived as the monistic fusion of Church and Empire, is distinguished from "caesaropapism," taken to imply Caesar's *absolute* rule of the spiritual. As has been seen, the fact of his *determining* that monistic whole is enough. All things considered, it is a sign of caesaropapism's extraordinary vitality that a surrender of God's things to Caesar should in our own days be called "theocracy."

[15] The *non sequitur* of the Byzantine appeasement current has survived to this day in much modern scholarship. It consists basically in a failure to make the necessary distinction between the Christian and the monistic point of view and in the consequent endeavor to represent the Fathers of the Church as Byzantine monists. It manifests itself in several ways: (1) Grounding monistic conclusions in the above Christian doctrine of political authority as derived ultimately from God (cf., e.g., Rommen, *The State in Catholic Thought*, pp. 220-222, 225-228, 372-373, 421-427, 428-429, etc.) or in that of the Catholic State's duty to aid and defend religion (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 366-368). A classic example of this in the past is the Constantinopolitan patriarch Anthony IV's teaching, on the basis of *I Peter* 2:17, that the unique and "cosmocratic" Byzantine Emperor was as necessary for the Christians as the Church (*infra*, n. 34). In the same strain, today, it is, for instance, surely forcing to a rather ludicrous degree the words attributed to Chrysostom, commenting on, and in the tradition of, the above and similar scriptural texts, to hold them "to justify the Byzantine imperial government as a part of the divine plan for the universe" (M. Anastos, "Political Theory in the Lives of the Slavic Saints Constantine and Methodius," *Harvard Slavic Studies*, II [1954], 35-36). Anthony IV, to be sure, was aided by a meso-Byzantine titulary evolution in his interpretation of the *Prima Petri*'s τὸν βασιλέα as referring exclusively to the Roman Emperors and their Byzantine successors. But it is somewhat astonishing that this Byzantine play on words should have retained its attraction to our own day. Thus, we find the kingly dignity, in terms of which the Fathers explained God or referred to Him, treated as specifically *imperial* dignity, and have definite conclusions drawn therefrom (as, e.g., in Setton, *Christian Attitude*); else we find it regarded as implying a special relationship between God and the Roman Emperor (as, e.g., in Anastos, pp. 31-32). What is overlooked here is (a) that in the Gospels

and ecclesiastical reliance on imperial support were exploited for regarding the empire as the necessary shell of the Church. At the same time, the quite orthodox theory of the predestined role the empire might have played in preparing the advent of Christianity was understood to imply its divinely instituted position of a coequal and

---

God is constantly compared to a king and Our Lord admits His own royal dignity in *Luke* 23:2-3; *John* 18:37 (the word is βασιλεύς etc.) without thereby suggesting any connection, special or other, with the Roman Empire (the Emperor—ironically—is always καῖσαρ, *not* βασιλεύς: *Matt.* 22:17, 21; *Mark* 12:14, 16, 17; *Luke* 2:1; 3:1; 20:22, 24, 25; 23:2; *John* 19:12, 15), and (b) that, prior to the Emperor Heraclius (A.D. 629), the word βασιλεύς regularly signified "king" and was, thus, used of various monarchs, as well as, unofficially in the Hellenistic East, of the Emperor; in the fifth century the former use indeed tended to become restricted (so far as barbarians were concerned: Procopius, e.g., uses it reluctantly for the Goth kings or replaces it by ῥήξ; *Hist. of the Wars*, V, 1.26; VI, 14.38; but not with regard to kings of ancient civilized States, like Armenia or Iberia, still always βασιλεῖς) and in the seventh century came to an end, βασιλεύς becoming, instead of αὐτοκράτωρ, the official translation of *imperator;* cf. G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (Munich, 1952), p. 86; Bréhier, *Institutions*, pp. 48-50; Treitinger, *Kaiser-u.Reichsidee*, p. 186; Leclercq, *art. cit.*, col. 2757-2764. It is, therefore, rather difficult to suppose the apostolic and patristic use of the word to have been primarily inspired, not by its scriptural associations and indeed its normal use, but by a titular tendency within the Byzantine State which reached its full development only in the seventh century.—(2) Postulating equal evidence value, so far as the inherence of the monistic ideology is concerned, both for unmistakable statements of that ideology, such as pass like a red thread through Byzantine history from Eusebius of Caesarea to Anthony IV (cf. *infra*, n. 16), and for isolated words: official terms which may or may not have been used with that ideology in view: meaningfully by its adherents or as a mere form by its opponents. Official terms, like *divus*, were indeed becoming empty formulae of respectful mention (Leclercq, "Adoration," *Dict.d'Arch.chrét.et de Lit.*, I [1924], 541); and a list of them taken out of context (as, e.g., of those used in councils, cf. Anastos, p. 29, nn. 40, 41) is hardly as significant as the one expression: θεὸς ἐγκόσμιος, used of the Emperor by Theophylact of Achrida († *c.* 1108) in a private letter (*Patr. Graeca*, CXXVI, 516) or the doctrine of Macarius of Ancyra (XVth c.) that Our Lord placed His Church in the Emperor's keeping (*On the Errors of the Latins*, ed. Dositheus in Τόμος καταλλαγῆς [Jassy, 1692] pp. 194-195).—(3) Overlooking or minimizing (thanks to the above) the struggle between Christianity and monism that went on—the very dynamic of Byzantinism—while, prior to becoming an overtly monistic, temporally-determined body, Byzantine Christianity was in formal and organic union with the supra-temporal and dualistic body of the Catholic Church; cf. my review of Medlin, *Journ. Mod. Hist.*, XXV, 419-420; *Christian Caucasia*, § 6.

coeval partner of the Church, a theophanic State—Babylon camouflaged as Jerusalem.[16] Finally, even the pagan cult of Caesar, *sancti*

[16] Bréhier, *Institutions,* Bk. I; Treitinger, *Kaiser-u.Reichsidee;* Dölger, "Europas Gestaltung im Spiegel der fränkisch-byzantinischen Auseinandersetzung des 9. Jahrhunderts," *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Ettal, 1953), pp. 291-293; "Bulgarisches Zartum und byzantinisches Kaisertum," *ibid.,* pp. 140-144.—Eusebius of Caesarea was largely the formulator of this ideology; cf. Baynes, *Eusebius and the Christian Empire;* Peterson, *Monotheismus,* pp. 49-147; H. G. Opitz, "Euseb von Cäsarea als Theologe," *Zeitschrift für NTliche Wissenschaft,* XXXIV (1935); H. Eger, "Kaiser und Kirche in der Geschichtstheologie Eusebs von Cäsarea," *ibid.,* XXXVIII (1939); H. Berkhof, *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Amsterdam, 1939); Cranz, *De Civ. Dei, XV, 2;* "Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea," *Harvard Theological Review,* XLV (1952); Setton, *Christian Attitude,* pp. 40-56. Constantine VII's Ceremonial Book and like documents showed the manifestations of this ideology; in its context the meaningfulness of various ceremonial formulae can be determined (cf. *supra,* n. 15). It was, at bottom, an expression of the Greek, and in fact of the all too human, tendency to determine the greater by the less—be it anthropomorphism or caesaropapism—to consider the Kingdom of God as circumscribed by the microcosm of the "unique" Roman Empire (which, by the way, was, even before Constantine, outspread, in fact no less than in intention, by the Church). It was, too, the road of least resistance to ignore the failure of the Israel-Babylon symbiosis, to consider Babylon Jerusalem, and to overlook what Origen had foreseen, namely, that "la relation de l'Eglise et de la Cité temporelle ne peut jamais être conçue comme l'harmonie de deux sociétés juxtaposées... mais comme la tension dramatique de deux époques successives de l'histoire totale" (J. Daniélou, *Essai sur le mystère de l'histoire* [Paris, 1953], p. 23). This harmony ought to be striven for, but it cannot be taken for granted. Finally, in justifying monotheism before the pagans by an argument from monarchy, Eusebius failed to see that a complete unity of the world can be achieved only eschatologically and that, until then, it is only within the Church, spiritually, that the world can be one (*ibid.,* pp. 57-58). History proved him wrong. Borrowing Fr. Daniélou's language (cf. pp. 49-60; *Salvation of the Nations,* trans. A. Bouchard [New York, 1950], chap. IV), it can be said that in attaching Christianity to a polity Eusebius and the Byzantine monists, whom he provided with a formulated ideology, caused a reversal to the divisive "economy of the angels" away from the catholic reign of Christ, to Babel away from Pentecost, and that they did not complete the spirituality of the Incarnation by accepting it as a way to the Transfiguration. The fruit of this, suggesting an oblivion of Original Sin, was the Byzantine theophanic complacency, glimpses of which can now be caught in the Russian attitude to the "outside" (cf., e.g., the late Prince N. Trubetzkoy's generalizations in comparing Catholic and Byzantine Christianity; "Introduction to the History of Old Russian Literature," *Harvard Slavic Studies,* II, 95-98, where we are told, *inter alia,* that "while Occidental Christianity *became* an international or, rather, supranational organization, Eastern Christianity *always remained* national" [italics mine]—and this in the face of *Matt.* 28:19; *Mark* 13:10; *Luke* 24:47; *Gal.* 3:28 etc.!).

palatii ritus, was retained continuing—a veritable liturgy of the palace —parallel with Christian worship.[17]

Still another pre-Christian heritage came to play a part in the psychology of the Byzantines. It was their conception of universality. Now, the universality of the Catholic Church is objective: the universal—cosmic—character of Christianity concerns the entire world, "all nations." On the other hand, the universality of the Roman Empire can be described as subjective.[18] The historical myopy of the classical world has been pointed out by Spengler.[19] The same myopy, or subjectivism, marked also the classical concept of the universe. The Hellenistic *oikoumene* tended to designate solely the world of Hellenism; likewise, the Roman Empire was thought of by its denizens as containing the world, to be the *orbis terrarum,* although the existence of polities and peoples outside it was well known to them.[20] While for a brief moment the empire and Christendom seemed co-extensive, the difference between the two conceptions was not apparent. But soon both coincidences ceased.[21] The Church centered at Rome kept the Christian objective idea; the empire centered at Constantinople retained the pre-Christian, subjective one. Consequently, for the Byzantines their empire was the universe: *oikoumene* or *ta oikoumena,* all outside being the desert of barbarism.[22] With the

[17] Bréhier, *Institutions,* pp. 53-88; Treitinger, *Kaiser- u. Reichsidee.*

[18] Toumanoff, *Caesaropapism,* pp. 225-226.

[19] *The Decline of the West,* I, Introduction, iv, trans. C. F. Atkinson (New York, 1932), pp. 8-11.

[20] Cf. J. Kaerst, *Die antike Idee der Oikumene* (Leipzig, 1903); F. Gisinger, "Oikumene (*οἰκουμένη*)," Pauly, Wissowa, Kroll, *Real-Encycl. der class.Altertumswiss.,* XVII (1937), 2123-2174, esp. 2124 (enumeration of various meanings noted by J. Partsch; cf. meanings 5 and 6) and 2138-2141; the body of the art. treats of the scientific, and objective, conception of *oikoumene.*—Even though the Stoics spoke of the cosmos, they did not envision a universal *society*: this was left for the Catholic Church to do; Gilson, Foreword to *Saint Augustine,* pp. xiv-xxvii.

[21] Cf. *supra,* nn. 7, 8. It has been argued that the true heir of the *pax romana,* of the Senate no less than of the Synagogue, is the Church (K. Thieme, *Gott und die Geschichte,* cited by Daniélou, *op. cit.,* pp. 42-44); this would leave the Byzantines in possession of only the Babylonian aspect of pagan Rome; cf. *supra,* n. 6.

[22] Treitinger, *Kaiser u. Reichsidee,* pp. 164-165; cf. J. Reiske's comments on the *De cerimoniis; Patr. Graeca,* CXII, 828 n. 6, 1256 n. 42; Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin,* pp. 22-24 (in connection with the title of oecumenical patriarch); Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome,* pp. 33, 36 (citing G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate*), 42, 45 n. 3, 46.

diminution of their realm, their subjective, microcosmic, universe shrank and became a mere fraction of Christendom. It was probably in connection with this Byzantine microcosmic psychology that the word *katholikos* tended to mean, in Byzantine society, also that which is part of a whole.[23]

From the meeting of all this pagan heritage with the tension between the two imperial cities sprang the theory of "Neo-Romism." Long after Constantinople had become the seat of Caesar, Rome still enjoyed the prestige of the matrix of the empire. Yet Constantinople, the *basilis polis,* claimed to be the image and successor of the older city—a new or Second Rome.[24] But Rome had two different aspects: the older center of the *imperium* was at the same time the See of Peter and the only center of the *sacerdotium.* Constantinople was envious of both aspects, and, true to her inherent caesaropapism, confused them. Accordingly, the Byzantines never tired of insinuating that, *because* it was the seat of Caesar, the see of the "New Rome" ought to rank next to papal Rome, or—this was the next step—even to supersede her in the headship of the Church.[25] The spiritual, thus, was fully determined by the temporal.

[23] Cf. Bréhier, *La civilisation byzantine* (Paris, 1950), p. 421. To state with C. Swietlinski (*La conception sociologique de l'oecuménicité dans la pensée religieuse russe contemporaine* [Paris, 1938], p. 38, cited by B. Tatakis, *La philosophie byzantine,* in E. Bréhier, *Histoire de la philosophie,* Deuxième fasc. suppl. [Paris, 1949], p. vii) that, unlike the Western, "quantitative," conception of catholicity, the Eastern conception is qualitative and "signifie union avec le tout," is to mean hardly anything at all. L. Bréhier's "union ou . . . communion avec un ensemble" is, on the other hand, meaningful.

[24] For the neo-Roman pretensions of Constantinople see F. Dölger, "Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner," *Byzanz u. die eruop. Staatenwelt,* pp. 70-115 (= *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* LVI, 1937, 1-42). For the Western counterpart of "Neo-Romism," a tradition decidedly bookish and unconnected with spiritual claims, see W. Hammer, "The Concept of the New or Second Rome in the Middle Ages," *Speculum,* XIX (1944), 50-62.

[25] Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin,* pp. 10-27, 168-169, 152, 188; Bréhier, *Institutions,* pp. 461-506, esp. 487 (it is hardly correct to speak of Constantinople's second place in the Universal Church after Chalcedon, in view of the fact that its canon 28 was quashed by the Head of that Church and his right so to act recognized at the time by the Byzantines themselves; nor is it exact to refer to the Patriarch Eustace VII as seeking "hierarchical equality" with the Pope; cf. Jugie, pp. 168-169, 188); T. O. Martin, "The Twenty-Eighth Canon of Chalcedon: A Background Note," in A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon,* II (Würzburg, 1953), 433-458.

The counter-current to the appeasement expressed the *non possumus* of the Church. Those of the Byzantine Christians, lay and clerical, who from the beginning of the Christian empire—they were prefigured by Constantine and the two Eusebii—lent their support to its latent monism, were from the beginning faced with a resolute defense of the primacy and independence of the spiritual on the part of the Church's official spokesmen, popes and fathers—Julius, Innocent, Leo, Gelasius, and Hosius, Hilary, Athanasius, Basil, Ambrose, Augustine.[26]

[26] For the Popes see J.-R. Palanque, in Fliche-Martin, III, 228-236; G. Bardy, *ibid.*, IV (Paris, 1948), 241-267, 337-341; A. Ziegler, "Pope Gelasius I and His Teaching on the Relation of Church and State," *The Catholic Historical Review*, XXVII (1942), 412-437. Pope Liberius ought to be added to this list (cf. Bardy, in Fliche-Martin, III, 142-146; Setton, *Christian Attitude*, pp. 88-89); as for his "case," it is far less certain, than is supposed by some (e.g., Bardy, pp. 154-155; Setton, pp. 88, 89), that "the last word has yet been said on this intricate matter"; B. C. Butler, *The Church and Infallibility* (New York, 1954), p. 167, n. 3.—For the Fathers, see, e.g., Setton, pp. 78-108, 109-151, 163-195; P. H. Rahner, *Abendländische Kirchenfreiheit* (Einsideln-Cologne, 1943); J. B. Lo Grasso, *Ecclesia et Status... Fonti selecti* (Rome, 1939); also, G. Reilly, *Imperium and Sacerdotium according to St. Basil the Great* (*The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity*, VII [Washington, 1945]); Gilson, Foreword to *Saint Augustine;* P. de Labriolle, in Fliche-Martin, IV, esp. 52-59; Dawson, in *A Monument to Saint Augustine*, pp. 43-77; Cranz, *De Civitate Dei, XV, 2.*—Recent historical literature manifests the (purely Byzantine) failure to distinguish clearly between several totally different attitudes of the Fathers and churchmen towards the temporal power, *viz.*, (1) the traditional Catholic attitude, recognizing the lawfulness and dignity of God-given civil authority and the duty of the Catholic ruler to aid and defend the faith; (2) one of courtesy towards the ruler, expressed in the use of the ceremonial formulae of respect then *de rigueur* (whatever their origin); and (3) one actually expressing societal monism in Christian terms. Thus, e.g., one should be able to distinguish between Eusebius' description of the Emperor in terms of Godhead (Setton, p. 48) and his and Athanasius' explaining God in terms of kingship (*ibid.*, pp. 47, 71-73). The *non sequitur* of deducing attitude 3 from 1 and 2 has been commented upon (*supra*, n. 15). It is, also, decidedly seeing things out of their historical context to treat the above formulae as instances of obsequiousness (cf. Setton, pp. 70, 215-216, where there is hardly any need for the indignation over St. Gregory the Great's "paeans of praise" to Phocas, since the basis for it has been shown to be inexistent; cf. M. V. Hay, *A Chain of Error in Scottish History* [London, 1927], pp. 127-149; cf. also L. Bréhier, in Fliche-Martin, V [Paris, 1947], 69-71), when even within one epoch, our own for instance, "kissing hands" (of a chief of State) would be an intolerable servility on the one side of the Atlantic, and yet is a ceremonial routine on the other.

The first—Catholic—half of Byzantine history was taken up by that struggle. In the course of it, Caesar, aided by the appeasement current in Byzantine Christianity, caused many a breach between his subjects and the Apostolic See which, save for a century and a half between Justinian I and Justinian II, was increasingly independent of the imperial control. Always healed at first, and always on the Roman terms, these periods of separation from the Catholic communion, nevertheless, ultimately bore their fruit. After the Iconoclastic epoch, Byzantine Christianity was being noticeably de-Catholicized. While the appeasement party (we may call them the *Politiques*) remained unchanged, the Catholic party, the current from Athanasius to Theodore of Studion, was degenerating into a merely clericalist one, represented by men like Ignatius or Cerularius.[27]

The de-Catholicizing of Byzantine Christianity under the impact of the pre-Christian monistic traditions is, perhaps, best exemplified by the formation of a new ecclesiological conception, which was utterly at variance with that previously held by all Christians, and to which now all the Byzantines had come to adhere. The belief in the Catholic Church gave way, among them, to one in the Imperial Church, that is to say, the empire-determined—Caesar-determined—Church, circumscribed by the microcosm of the Byzantine subjective universe. Within that body, the will of Caesar, rather than the voice of Peter, had become the touchstone of orthodoxy. This conception, always, though at first vaguely, present in the caesaropapist circles, ripened and gained in general acceptance between Photius and Cerularius.[28]

[27] Cf. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin*, pp. 1-186; Bardy, in Fliche-Martin, III, 97-176; J.-R. Palanque, *ibid.*, pp. 237-296; Bardy, in Fliche-Martin, IV, 163-240, 271-320; L. Bréhier, *ibid.*, pp. 423-495; *idem*, in Fliche-Martin, V, 55-77, 131-209, 431-470; E. Amann, "L'époque carolingienne," Fliche-Martin, VI (Paris, 1947). The Photian episode must still be regarded as awaiting a final word, and a proper perspective; for a discussion of the recent literature on the subject, of which F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism: History and Legend* (Cambridge, 1948) is the best known work, see Dölger-Schneider, *Byzanz*, pp. 134-138. A discussion in connection with the "parties" in Byzantine Christianity will be found in my *Christian Caucasia*, n. 27.—Byzantine history is often written nowadays as though its Catholic phase had never existed and societal monism had, without a struggle, been triumphant from the start. The *non sequitur* noted *supra*, nn. 15, 26, has helped considerably to create this impression.

[28] To this ripening, the Iconoclastic controversy undoubtedly contributed. It has been shown by G. Ladner in his admirable article "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," *Mediaeval Studies*, II (1940), 127-

Simultaneously, the Byzantine concept of Catholicity was gradually impaired by "microcosmism"; and the doctrine of papal authority obscured by the newly risen Byzantine theory of the divinely instituted patriarchal pentarchy as the government of the Church.[29] The so-called Cerularian Schism of 1054 was, consequently, not so much a rupture as a preclusion of further reunions between what had now definitely assumed the shape of an Imperial Church, on the one hand, and the Church Universal on the other. The fruit was ripe, Cerularius merely shook the tree.[30] To this final separation various other factors, psychological, cultural, political, human, had also contributed; this study is concerned solely with the role of the pre-Christian imperial tradition of societal monism.

With the formation of the Byzantine establishment, a new phase was opened in the history of the Eastern Empire. The Catholic phase was over, the "Greek-Orthodox" one was ushered in. It signified the end of the age-old struggle between the cosmic and dualistic Christian tradition and the microcosmic and monistic one, retained from pre-Christian times.[31] The *raison d'être* of Greek-Orthodoxy was the repudiation of the papacy as a safeguard of the primacy, inde-

---

149, that the exaggerations of the Byzantine Iconodules were no less divergent from the Catholic position than the negations of the Iconoclasts. These exaggerations made it easy to conceive of the Byzantine microcosm—in the truly Eusebian tradition—as the *necessary* image, or icon, of Heaven, and one relatively *identical* with it. Obviously, in this "living icon" of Byzantinism there was no place for the Papacy and Catholicity: both were relegated to the ἔρημος or ἀοίκητος of those "outside."

[29] Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin*, pp. 32-39; T. Spačil, S.J., "Conceptus et doctrina de Ecclesia juxta theologiam Orientis separati," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, II (1924), 67-68.

[30] Cf. A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, 2 vols. (Paderborn, 1925, 30); Jugie, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-246; E. Amann, in Fliche-Martin, VII (Paris, 1948), 111-152; also R. Janin's summing up: "Le schisme byzantin de 1054," *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXXVI, 6 (1954), 563-575; and the bibliographical survey in Dölger-Schneider, *Byzanz*, pp. 142-143.

[31] A distinction, I think, could be made between the Church's second (and ultimately unsuccessful) attempt at a symbiosis of the two societies, spiritual and temporal, and the above victory of societal monism in Byzantine Christianity resulting from the failure of the first such attempt. The mediaeval unity was not one of a Church circumscribed by a subjectively oecumenical empire, but one of an empire (co-existing with a number of theoretically vassal States), called into being by the Church as a counterpoise to Byzantium, because

pendence, and true universality of the spiritual. The bishop of the "New Rome" might, in the new conditions, congratulate himself with having superseded the pope in his own microcosmic *oikoumene*[32] and with being occasionally treated as a diarch by Caesar,[33] but it

seemingly free from the "Babylonian" heritage, and invited by her to share her objective universality. Whatever the opinions of the monistic and Byzantinesque "fringe" of Catholic Christianity (ranging from the Norman Anonymous or the *Tractatus Eboricenses*, a Frederick II or a Marsilius of Padua to milder Imperialists and Regalists), historically, the "sacredness" of the Holy Roman Empire and other Catholic monarchies owed its *raison d'être* to their association with the Church (though it was occasionally argued in monistic terms), and not to an uninterrupted pre-Christian tradition (occasionally cast in Christian terms). In any case, this resurgence of "Babylon" was never accepted by the Church, the existence of whose Center, the Papacy, constituted a guarantee of the primacy, independence, and universality of the spiritual and an obstacle to all attempts to reduce her to a temporally-determined body. As for some of the "extreme" Papalist writers (always to be distinguished from the *magisterium* of the Church), such as Aegidius Romanus or Alvarus Pelagius, while advocating a universal "meta-political" overlordship, a super-eminent *dominium*, of the Roman Pontiff—and of this the doctrine of the primacy of the spiritual can admit, as it cannot of caesaropapism (cf. *supra*, n. 4)—they did not, it seems, in any sense depart from dualism towards a monistic solution by suggesting, e.g., the replacement of temporal rulers by ecclesiastics. This problem has been recently treated in *The Review of Politics*, IX (1947): G. Ladner, "Aspects of Mediaeval Thought on Church and State," pp. 403-422, esp. 406-410; A.-H. Chroust, "The Corporate Idea and the Body Politic in the Middle Ages," pp. 423-452, esp. 433-436.

[32] Weakened by Monophysitism and Islam, the remaining Catholic patriarchates of the Byzantine world—Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—gradually fell under the sway of Constantinople and ultimately, though (it seems) not immediately, followed the Cerularian separation from Rome. In the last phase of the Empire's existence, Constantinople indeed lost control over certain newly formed phyletic independencies (*infra*, n. 42), but she became, in the thirteenth century, the unquestioned mistress of the older patriarchates of the East, to the point of replacing their ancient liturgies (Alexandrian and Antiochene) by the Byzantine rite; cf. Bréhier, *Institutions*, pp. 456-460, 461-476; and, for the recent literature, Dölger-Schneider, *Byzanz*, pp. 127-130.

[33] This "diarchy," postulated in the Basilid documents stemming from the *Epanagoge* (V. Sokol'skij, "O xarakterě i značenii Epanagogi," *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, I [1894]; G. Vernadsky, "Vizantijskie učenija o vlasti carja i patriarxa," *Recueil Kondakov* [1926]; "Die kirchlich-politische Lehre der Epanagoge und ihr Einfluss auf das russische Leben im XVII.Jahrhundert," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, VI [1928]; Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, pp. 25-28) is vitiated by the subsequent Byzantine doctrine on the subject, as revealed in canon law and imperial practice (*infra*, n. 34, Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin*, pp. 413-416, 403-406). The "diarchy" was a theoretical recompense for a very real subjection.

was Caesar who had acquired, *de jure* now, most of the papal functions. The duties of ruling, teaching, and unifying were officially rendered to Caesar by the empire-determined Church, as witness the concord between the doctrines of great Byzantine canonists and imperial claims and practice.[34] For obvious technical reasons, however, the duty of sanctifying remained within the clergy's competence.[35] Church and State formed now one *corpus politicum mysticum*,[36] a "theocracy" of which the temporal power was the determining factor and in which the monistic surrender to it of the spiritual was graced with the euphemism of *symphonia*.[37] This continuation of imperial

[34] The Emperor was placed above all canons and laws and held the supreme power of jurisdiction in the Greek Orthodox Church (Balsamon, *In can. 16 Carth., Patr.Graeca*, CXXXVIII, 93; In can. 38 Trull., *ib.* CXXXVIII, 644); he was greater than the Patriarch, being in charge of both men's souls and bodies and not, like the latter, of their souls only (*idem, Meditata sive responsa de patr. privil., ibid.*, col. 1017); he was held to possess the supreme teaching authority, being the Supreme Doctor of the Church, and he united in his person all the privileges of the pontificate, save Holy Orders (Chomatenus [Chomatianus], *Resp. ad Const. Cabasilam*, in J. Leunclavius, *Jus graeco-rom.* [Frankfort, 1596], V, 317); he was, finally, declared to be as essential for the Christians as the Church herself (Anthony IV of Constantinople to Basil I of Muscovy, in Mikloschich and Müller, *Acta et dipl. gr. medii aevi*, II [Vienna, 1862], 191). Cf. Bréhier, *Institutions*, pp. 430-442; Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin*, pp. 403-406; also *supra*, n. 13. All this, it must be owned, reduced the ecclesiastical "diarch" to the position of a mere secretary for sacramental affairs. Thus Byzantine canon law rendered *de jure* to Caesar, after the final break with Rome, those of God's things which he had from the start endeavored to make *de facto* his own. It is symptomatic of the difference observed *supra*, n. 31, that in Byzantium it was the canonists and the Church leaders who propounded the high "Imperialist" doctrines.

[35] Cf. L. Bréhier, Ἱερεὺς καὶ βασιλεύς, *Mémorial L. Petit* (= *Archives de l'Orient chrétien*, I [1948]), pp. 4-45.

[36] This phrase is used here not in the Suarezian sense indicative of an analogy between the temporal and the spiritual society, but as an indication of the fact that the Empire arrogated to itself the spiritual, and indeed supernatural, character of the Church; for this, see Treitinger, *Kaiser- u. Reichsidee*, pp. 158-160; Bréhier, *Institutions*, p. 431.

[37] The denial of the inherence of caesaropapism in Byzantium, at any rate in the "mediaeval," i.e., post-Iconoclastic, period, a protagonist of which has been G. Ostrogorsky ("Otnošenie cerkvi i gosudarstva v Vizantii," *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, IV [1931]; *Gesch.d.byz.Staates*, p. 192, n.2), is based on several misconceptions which I took the liberty of pointing out in *Caesaropapism*, pp. 230-222. How the συμφωνία postulated by the "diarchy" corresponded to reality has already been seen. The cessation of strife was due to the surrender of the spiritual to the temporal in Byzantine society, a triumph of caesaropapism; cf. my *Christian Caucasia*, § 7.

Rome was, whatever its protestations, in no sense Christian Rome's successor.[38]

Before the fall of the Eastern Empire, its societal monism showed a change of emphasis. The once multi-national policy was in its final phase dwindling till it became a Greek city-state, and, with the imperial structure on the verge of destruction, Greek nationality appeared to be the only vital element in it.[39] Accordingly, the temporal element, which continued monistically to control the spiritual, did so less in its political aspect now, and increasingly more in its ethnic, its phyletic, aspect. In other words, the local Imperial Church, which had been formed through a secession from the Church Universal, now become a local national Church. This is the reason why all the attempts of the Palaeologan emperors and of the intellectual élite supporting them to effect a reunion with the Apostolic See were met with the nation's rejection.[40] Monistic Byzantine Orthodoxy was no longer the emperor's thing: it was a phyletic thing. One secession, however, had in the meantime begotten others. The Byzantine subjective notion of universality, "microcosmism," was heavy with fragmentation, since every geo-political unit might conceive of itself as a microcosmic universe. In conjunction with caesaropapism, each such unit might regard itself as a church-embracing polity. The emphasis on the phyletic aspect of societal monism and nationalization of the Imperial Church, when meeting with the separatist tendencies of the rapidly dwindling empire's "pneumatic" children,[41] further con-

[38] A curious deviation from the persistent Byzantine claims to Roman continuity (imperial and Christian) is found in the tradition represented by Andrew of Caesarea, in the sixth-seventh century, and by Arethas of Caesarea and the Slavic biographer of St. Cyril (Constantine), in the ninth, stressing the difference between the pagan Empire and the Christian one of Constantine which succeeded it; cf. Anastos, *Political Theory*, p. 18.

[39] For the rise of Hellenic nationalism in the Balkanized "New Rome" see A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Madison, 1953), pp. 582, 687; for its connection with the intellectual development culminating in the neo-paganism of Pletho, Tatakis, *Philosophie byzantine*, pp. 228-306. In this context, the adjective "Hellene" tended to replace the imperial one of "Roman"; for an early instance (during the Nicaean interlude), cf. D. Geanakoplos, in *Traditio*, IX (1953), 422 n. 13; also Tatakis, p. 230; Bréhier, *Civilisation byz.*, p. 329.

[40] These attempts are discussed in Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin*, pp. 247-270.

[41] Attempts to reconcile the Byzantine transcription of monotheism in terms of the unique Empire (cf. *supra*, nn. 15, 16) with the existence of other Christian States, after the brief—and apparent—coextension of Empire and

tributed to the splitting of imperial Christendom into a number of phyletic churches.[42]

These, then, were the threads of pagan Romano-Hellenistic tradition which Byzantium handed down to Russia. It remains to examine the fabric which Russia wove with them. Byzantium was the dominant cultural, political, and economic factor on the horizon of the proto-

---

Christendom had ceased, resulted in emphasizing the legal fiction of the Emperor as father or eldest brother in the spiritual, "pneumatic," family of Christian princes: Dölger, "Die 'Familie der Könige' im Mittelalter," "Die mittelalterliche 'Familie der Fürsten und Völker' und der Bulgarenherrscher," *Byzanz u. die europ. Staatenwelt*, pp. 34-69, 159-182; A. Grabar, "God and the 'Family of Princes' presided over by the Byzantine Emperor," *Harvard Slavic Studies*, II, 117-123.

[42] All this was, at bottom, a reversal from the psychology of pagan Rome's state religion, which had informed Byzantine Christianity, back to the anterior one of tribal cults. Even before this phyletism affected the Empire itself, it had, in conjunction with "microcosmism" and caesaropapism, caused the separation from it of some dependencies; cf. the Bulgarian venture in the ninth century (cf. *infra*, n. 56), and, earlier still, in connection with dogmas at variance with the faith of the then Catholic Emperor, the Monophysite secession (the role of this combined Byzantine inheritance in the formation of the Armenian Church is analyzed in my *Christian Caucasia*). Now, with the Church of the shrinking Empire becoming a Greek Church, or even occasionally several Greek Churches (Constantinople-Nicaea, Trebizond, Epirus), the Georgian, Balkan, and Russian ecclesiastical formations gradually, and in varying degrees, tended away from Byzantine allegiance; cf. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin*, pp. 271-273; Bréhier, *Institutions*, pp. 470-472. Constantinople, however, was recompensed somewhat by her increased control over the Melkites (cf. *supra*, n. 32). Several factors remained, nevertheless, to hold together the various fragments of the Imperial Church within what may be regarded as its new manifestation: the Greek-Orthodox communion. These were (1) the common Byzantine cultural tradition (including the Byzantine rite); (2) the common monistic *raison d'être* (implying a rejection of the primacy of the spiritual); and (3) "microcosmism" expressed, in space, by a rejection of Catholicity and, in time, by a negation of further development (arrested development). The Greek-Orthodox attitude towards the question of authority in the Church is a good illustration of the largely negative character of this unity. In the Imperial Church, the Papal powers were transferred to the Emperor (*supra*, n. 34); but between the rise of phyletism and the fall of the Empire, the doctrine of Pontifical Caesar as the seat of authority was wrecked. Under the Turks, the Constantinopolitan patriarch indeed attempted to gather Caesar's inheritance, but his claims could be enforced only by the might of Ottoman arms (Jugie, pp. 272-273). Outside the Sultan's realm (except, at first, in Russia), he was allowed merely a vague primacy among the heads of the other phyletic Churches. As a result, though unanimously rejecting the Papal authority (which the East had once accepted—

Russians. When Kievan Russia emerged out of the chaos of Slavic tribes, Ural-Altaic conquerors, and Scandinavian adventurers, her religion and culture were received from the Byzantines.[43] True enough, the conversion of the Russians took place prior to Constantinople's definitive separation from the See of Peter—and history has preserved traces of early-Russian Catholicism—but that link had become, we have seen, increasingly tenuous long before 1054—merely a formal bridge over the material chasm.[44]

The Russian polity, however, was founded by Norsemen. And so, in the Kievan period, Byzantine elements among the Russians were counterbalanced by western European. The Rurikid dynasty, reigning in the princedoms into which the Russian territory was then divided, was a part of the western family of ruling houses. This fact, no occasional Byzantine matrimonial alliance could, for all its prestige, outweigh. A monarch like Vladimir II Monomakh (1113-1125)

---

suffice it to recall here the Libellus of St. Hormisdas, of 519), Greek-Orthodoxy can offer no official and generally received doctrine on authority in the Church; Spačil, *Conceptus et doctrina de Ecclesia;* cf. Dom F. Mercenier's review in *Stoudion,* II, 4 (1925), 121-125; Jugie, pp. 325-398.—The term "phyletism" is due to Constantinople herself, when, in 1872, she, together with Alexandria, Antioch, and Cyprus, condemned the Bulgarian Church for the very thing which had contributed to her own separation from Rome (cf. Jugie, pp. 290-292). With "Caesar" taken to signify the State, and not the temporal element in general, phyletic caesaropapism has recently been aptly termed "ethnopapism"; cf. S. Tyszkiewicz, S.J., "Le visage de l'orthodoxie," *Nouvelle revue théologique,* LXXVI, 6, 613-614.

[43] The most recent treatment of Russian pre-history and early history will be found in G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia* (G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia,* I [New Haven, 1946]) and *Kievan Russia* (*ibid.,* II [New Haven, 1948]). In the latter work, the treatment of the conversion of Russia (pp. 48-70, esp. 61-62) stands in need of revision: there is hardly any reason for attempting to justify the apocryphal story of St. Vladimir's "choosing of the faith" interpolated into the narrative of the *Primary Chronicle;* for this, see E. Golubinskij, *Istorija russkoj cerkvi* (Moscow, 1901) I, 1, 105-187; *Russian Primary Chronicle,* trans. and ed. S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953), n. 92 (p. 245), cf. nn. 93, 94 (pp. 245-248).—In connection with the problem of Byzantine tradition in Russia see also I. Ševčenko, "A Neglected Byzantine Source of Muscovite Political Ideology," *Harvard Slavic Studies,* II, 141-179.

[44] Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *Primary Chronicle,* nn. 53 (p. 238), 64 (p. 240), 92 (p. 245), 99 (p. 249); A. Ammann, S.J., *Abriss der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna, 1950), pp. 10-28.

was, in spite of his surname, much closer to St. Louis than to Justinian;[44a] and the *Tale of Igor's War* is more akin to the *Chanson de Roland* than to the romance of Digenis Akritas.

On the other hand, the Church was in Russia the center of Byzantine cultural and political influence. Whatever its original juridical status—there are at least five different theories about this—the Kievan Church became, despite occasional recalcitrance, a dependency of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate.[45] That, from the Byzantine point of view, entailed Russian political subjection to the empire.[46] And, from that of the Rurikids, even if it be difficult to assert unequivocally their acceptance of the emperor's political control, there did obtain a certain "meta-political," "pneumatic," ascendancy which they, together with the other members of Byzantine Christendom, conceded to the imperial *pontifex maximus* of the "New Rome."[47]

However, when the Imperial Church definitively broke with the Catholic communion, the Russian Church did not immediately follow its example. The close family ties binding the Rurikids to the West, the existence of an anti-Byzantine faction among the Russian clergy, and, finally, the fruition of Russia's own "microcosmism" constituted obstacles to the immediate success of the Cerularian secession in the Rurikid dominions. As Byzantium had been rent between conflicting attitudes toward Rome, so in Russia one can discern a polarity of

[44a] Unlike the Byzantine autocrat, who was a νόμος ἔμψυχος (A Steinwenter, "ΝΟΜΟΣ ΕΜΨΥΧΟΣ. Zur Geschichte einer politischen Theorie," *Anzeiger Akad.d. Wiss.Wien*, Phil.-hist. Kl., LXXXIII [1946], 250-268; Treitinger, *Kaiser- u. Reichsidee*, p. 215 ff.), the Kievan prince, like the mediaeval Western king, was under law; Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, pp. 287-290. The advent of the Mongols strengthened the impact of Byzantine ideas; *idem*, *The Mongols and Russia* (Vernadsky-Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, III [New Haven, 1953]), p. 386. For the personality of Vladimir II, see his Testament and other compositions in Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *Primary Chronicle*, pp. 206-219.

[45] Cf. Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *Primary Chronicle*, n. 171 (pp. 259-260); and the discussion of the recent literature on the subject in Dölger-Schneider, *Byzanz*, pp. 141-142.

[46] This stemmed from the doctrine of the unique and theophanic Empire; cf. Bréhier, *Institutions*, pp. 4-5, 282-283; W. Ensslin, "The Emperor and the Imperial Administration," in N. Baynes and H. Moss, *Byzantium* (Oxford, 1948), p. 273.

[47] Cf. *supra*, n. 41; Vasiliev, "Was Old Russia a Vassal State of Byzantium?" *Speculum*, VII (1932); Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, pp. 349-350.

urges, toward and away from Constantinople.[48] But the Byzantinophiles among the churchmen lost no time; they flooded the country with multifarious polemical writings, which in attacking the so-called "Latin errors" sought to justify the fatal separation.[49] Gradually a distaste for the West was instilled in the Russians, which was to be augmented by unfortunate relations with some western neighbors.

[48] Ammann, *Abriss d. ostslaw.Kirchengesch.*, pp. 25-61; Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *Primary Chronicle*, n. 238 (pp. 269-270); B. Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1924). For the inner tension, see Ammann, *loc. cit.*; Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, nn. 175 (pp. 260-261), 183 (p. 262), 265 (pp. 273-274), 282 (p. 275); Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, pp. 79-83, 96, 217-219; E. Amann, in Fliche-Martin, VII (1948), 449-451; for the genealogical ties: Leib, *op. cit.*; N. de Baumgarten, "Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides russes du X^e au XIII^e siècle," *Orientalia Christiana*, IX (1927); "Le dernier mariage de Saint Vladimir," *ibid.*, XVIII (1930).— From the facts at our disposal regarding the pre-Mongol history of the Russian Church it appears certain that during that period that religious body did not follow, officially at least, the Cerularian break with Rome. Among these facts, we find, e.g., that down to the end of the thirteenth century no question of a difference in religion was ever raised in connection with the numerous marriages of Rurikids with Catholics (Leib, pp. 143-178), and that Izjaslav I of Kiev (1054-1078), a friend of the monks of the Crypt Monastery, a leading center of Russia's religious life, placed his country under the protection of the Holy See, to which he expressed his fidelity, in 1075, while his son Jaropolk manifested his devotion to St. Peter the Apostle (Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, n. 238; text *ad ann.* 1086 [p. 169] and n. 245 [p. 271]). Vernadsky, therefore, rather begs the question when stating (*Kievan Russia*, p. 344) that the wives of the two princes "must have become, officially, members of the Greek Orthodox Church" though "it seems that neither broke with Roman Catholicism in her heart" (cf. also the explanations in connection with Anna Jaroslavna, Queen of France, pp. 342-343, and the reference to the legendary episode of Roman of Galicia-Volynia, pp. 345, 230 and n. 12: possibly this son of a Polish princess was falling under the influence of his Byzantine wife; cf. his genealogy in Baumgarten, *Généalogies*, pp. 23, 26, 47). It is to be remembered that even in Byzantium the immensity of the Cerularian secession was not realized at the time and that, whatever the attitude of the hierarchs, the simple faithful continued, for a half-century or so, to entertain friendly relations with the Catholics; cf. E. Card. Tisserant, "The Holy See and the Byzantine Church and Empire," *The Review of Politics*, IX (1947), p. 279.

[49] A. Pavlov, *Kritičeskie opyty po istorii drevnejšej greko-russkoj polemiki protiv latinjan* (St. Petersburg, 1878); Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin*, pp. 236-239; Ammann, *Abriss d.ostslaw.Kirchengesch.*, pp. 33-36: cf. Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *Primary Chronicle*, nn. 92, 98 (pp. 248-249). Much of this polemic was concerned with preventing the Catholic marriages of the Rurikids.

The advent in the thirteenth century of the Mongols put an end to the ambiguity of Russia's position.[50] By including her within the empire of the Genghisids they created the—first—"Iron Curtain" between Russia and the West; they interrupted the promising development of the Kievan spring, plunging Russia into "Merovingian" conditions.[51] But Mongol policy was to patronize religion. Thus, the Byzantine spiritual contacts were not interrupted, and, in fact, the Russian Church rose in importance as a doubly privileged body and the sole unifying factor in the country. The Mongol temporal "Iron Curtain" completed the Byzantine spiritual one; and the seeds of Byzantine religious isolation sown in the eleventh century came to full fruition in the thirteenth.[52]

Meantime, the hegemony among the Rurikid princes, which the southern State of Kiev had lost even before the Mongol onslaught, was taken up, in the northeastern regions, by the Princes of Moscow.[53] This junior branch of the Rurikid house, supported to the hilt by the Russian Church, slowly began converting that hegemony of East Russia into a unitary sovereignty. The Muscovite princes successfully curried favor with their Mongol masters, who connived at their climbing,[54] and—also successfully—strove to Mongolize their own expanding State. The influence of the essentially monistic Mongol imperial ideology, changing Russia's socio-political aspect, served to enhance, and was in turn enhanced by, the monistic Byzantine tradition which had molded Russia's politico-religious *Weltanschauung*.[55] Thus,

[50] The most recent treatment of the Mongol domination of Russia and of the rise of the Muscovite State is in Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia*.

[51] So Spengler, *Decline of the West*, II, chap. VII, ii (p. 192), chap. X, ii (p. 335, n.1).

[52] Vernadsky, *Mongols*, pp. 152-153: "Russia's political dependence on the Mongols made her church safe from the pope's pressure [*sic*]."

[53] But not without opposition from some other princes, such as those of Tver', who strove to play the same role as Moscow; Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, chap. IV.

[54] Some attempts, however, were made by the Golden Horde to impede the rise of Moscow. Though the latter princedom had come to monopolize the grand ducal dignity, which implied overlordship vis-à-vis the other princes, the Khan exempted from it, raising to the same status of grand dukes, the Princes of Rjazan', Suzdal', and Tver'; Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 199, 201, 206, 255, 350.

[55] Mongol societal monism, inspired (not unlike Eusebius of Caesarea's) by a kind of monotheism, was utterly devoid of all "microcosmism" and conjoined with an objective concept of universality; cf. E. Voegelin, "The Mongol Orders of Submission to European Powers, 1245-1255," *Byzantion*, XV (1941), 378-

Muscovy was clasped within the embrace of two foster-parents, the empires of the "New Rome" and of the Golden Horde.

Within two centuries the balance shifted. The two imperial overlords were growing senile and Muscovy was coming of age. Soon, she set herself free from their tutelage. Muscovite rejection of the temporal suzerainty of the Horde was preceded and complemented by a spiritual emancipation. Precisely as the psychological separation of Byzantium from Rome had preceded the formal break, so now Moscow's emancipation from Constantinople was first psychologically achieved and then formally argued. The psychological separation sprang from the progressive fragmentation implied, as has been seen, in the conjunction of Byzantine "microcosmism," caesaropapism, and phyletism. The latter element, in particular, was suggestive of translating the Byzantine *corpus politicum mysticum* into the custody of a more vigorous race. The notion of a *translatio imperii* to one of Byzantium's "pneumatic" dependencies had thus been in the air for some time; it spawned the Bulgarian and Serbian "empires," with Caesar and Patriarch each, that troubled the sunset of Constantinople.[56] Since, however, the Imperial City was to them the matrix of the empire, these microcosmic empires strove further to strengthen their pretensions by attempting to conquer it. Only when these efforts failed did another solution present itself. The fourteenth-century Bulgarian translator of the chronicle of Constantine Manasses voiced it, when in rendering the Greek passage suggestive of the supersedure of Rome by Constantinople, he replaced the latter by "our new Imperial City (= *Cargrad*)," i.e., Trnovo, the Bulgarian capital.[57] *Translatio imperii* involved *translatio urbis*. Thus, Byzantine lessons worked in the end against the teachers. The fragmentation and separation contained within some of them have just been mentioned. Likewise, the idea of the *renovatio* implied in "Second-Romism" involved the possibility of a still "newer" city.

413; Vernadsky, *Mongols*, pp. 92-99, 102-103, 121-130; and chap. V. For the Mongolization of Muscovy see also G. Fedotov, "Russia and Freedom," *The Review of Politics*, VIII (1946), 16-17, 20.

[56] For this see V. Zlatarski, *Istorija na bulgarskata daržava prez srednite vekove* (Sofia, 1918, 1927, 1934, 1940); S. Runciman, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire* (London, 1930); K. Jiriček, *Geschichte der Serben* (Gotha, 1911, 1918); also Dölger, *Bulgarisches Zartum n.byz. Kaisertum; Die mittelalt. "Familie d. Fürsten u.Völker" u. der Bulgarenherrscher.*

[57] *Kronike lui Constantin Manasses*, ed. I. Bogdan (Bucarest, 1922), p. 99.

The same psychological preparation took place in Muscovy, where it was stimulated by South Slavic influences and (later) by certain Byzantine prophesies, and fostered by the phyletically caesaropapist clergy.[58] Already in 1393 Muscovite separatism obliged the Constantinopolitan patriarch to admonish a recalcitrant Rurikid grand duke of the Byzantine doctrine that the emperor was as essential for the Christians as the Church.[59] Then, there occurred two historic events which served as steps leading from psychological preparation to ideological argument. In 1439 the reunion of various Eastern Christian bodies with the Catholic Church was promulgated at the Council of Florence. But though accepted by both the Emperor and Patriarch of Constantinople and by Russia's primate, Cardinal Isidore, the Union of Florence was rejected by the Mongolizing[60] Grand Duke Basil II of Muscovy.[61] Byzantine instruction had not been lost upon Russia and proved once again detrimental to the teacher. Russia's faith in the "orthodoxy" of the "New Rome" was shaken. Following Florence, the Muscovites tended to regard Byzantium with the same mixture of emulation and disdain as the Byzantines had evinced toward Rome; the Kievan polarity of attitude had reappeared in Muscovy. The second event was the fall of Constantinople in 1453—a fitting punishment, in the Muscovite eyes, for the "defection" at Florence.[62]

[58] The latest discussion of this process is found in Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, pp. 62-124; cf. Strémooukhoff, *Moscow the Third Rome*.

[59] *Supra*, n. 34; cf. Medlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-71; Olšr, *Gli ultimi Rurikidi*, pp. 326.

[60] For Basil's Mongolizing and its connection with his sobriquet *Temnyj*, see Vernadsky, *Mongols*, pp. 320-322, 327-328, 383.

[61] Ammann, *Abriss d.ostlaw.Kirchengesch.*, pp. 137-147; Th. Ziegler, *Die Union des Konzils von Florenz in der russischen Kirche* (Würzburg, 1938); P. Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège, Etudes diplomatiques*, I (Paris, 1906), 1-59, 60-105.—By ousting the Cardinal-Metropolitan Isidore in 1441 and by having the Russian bishops elect Jonas of Rjazan' in his place in 1448, Basil II placed the Church of his realm in a state of virtual, though not official, schism from Constantinople, which had officially accepted the Union and on which the appointment of the heads of the Russian Church depended.

[62] Typical of this attitude are the anti-Florentine and, consequently, also anti-Byzantine pamphlets ascribed to that doubtful cleric, Simeon the Suzdalian, who hails Basil as a "defender of the faith" (in Malinin, *Starec Eleazarova monastyrja*, pp. 99-100), and also—very properly—the opinion of Jonas, who replaced Isidore, as to the well-merited fate of the Imperial City (*Pamjatniki drevne-russkago kanoničeskago prava*, in *Russkaja Istoričeskaja Biblioteka*, VI

The ideological argument was a thing of great simplicity. The Byzantine tradition received by Russia contained two cardinal doctrines: first, that the Roman Empire was a theophanic and divinely instituted polity which was coincident, coequal, and coeval with the Church and, therefore, like her imperishable; second, that orthodoxy was Caesar's—political or phyletic Caesar's—thing and, thus, inseparable from the empire. In this way, the Byzantine "betrayal" at Florence, on the one hand, and the downfall of Constantinople and of the South Slavic would-be empires, on the other, left Muscovy the sole Greek Orthodox polity practically, and soon completely, independent of Muslim rule and, consequently, alone capable and worthy of receiving the *translatio imperii*. Russia was of necessity the stage for the third act of the divine drama as manifested in Roman imperial history. "Second-Romism" had given birth to "Third-Romism": Moscow was the Third Rome.[63]

Already in 1451, between Florence and the fall of the imperial city, a Muscovite divine foreshadowed the idea of the "Third Rome."[64] In 1470, resuming the earlier trend of recalcitrance and continuing Basil II, the Grand Duke John III declared the Patriarch of Constantinople to be "deprived of any right over our Church."[65] In 1492,

---

[St. Petersburg, 1908], 623). Cf. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, pp. 66-76. The polarity of Russian attitude towards Byzantium is well illustrated in the case of John IV, who, on the one hand, sought the Constantinopolitan patriarch's recognition of his title (*infra*, n. 92) and, on the other, declared to Possevino that his religion was not that of the Greeks; cf. Pierling, *Papes et Tsars (1547-1597), d' après des documents nouveaux* (Paris, 1890), p. 312.

[63] For this argument see the bibliography, *supra*, n. 1; to this may be added: P. Miliukov, *Outlines of Russian Culture*, ed. M. Karpovich (Philadelphia, 1948), I, 1-26; Ammann, *Abriss d. ostslaw.Kirchengesch.*, pp. 157-166.—Prior to evolving their "Third-Romism," the Muscovites passed through a brief intermediary phase when, in connection with certain Byzantine prophesies (Pseudo-Methodius), they fancied themselves in the role of the eventual deliverers of the "Second Rome"; Strémooukhoff, *Moscow the Third Rome*, pp. 88-91.

[64] Jonas of Moscow to the Prince of Kiev, *Akty Istoričeskie*, ed. The Archaeographical Commission, I (St. Petersburg, 1841), No. 47. Cf. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, p. 75.

[65] *Akty sobrannye v bibliotekax i arxivax Rossijskoj Imperii*, ed. The Archaeographical Expedition of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, I (St. Petersburg, 1836), No. 80.—These several occurrences: the negation of Pontifical Caesar's authority in Muscovy (1393; *supra*, n. 59); the deposition of a Constantinopolitan appointee and instalment, without patriarchal consent, of another

another divine spoke of Moscow as the new City of Constantine.[66] Finally, a Russian chronicle dependent on the Bulgarian version of Manasses seemed to suggest, in 1512, the replacement of Trnovo by "our New Rome, the Imperial City (*Car'grad*)."[67]

The new idea found its final and fullest formulation in the epistles of the Pskovian monk, Philotheus, especially in that of (probably) 1511, addressed to John's son Basil III. Philotheus declared[68] that:

---

in his stead (1441-1448; *supra* n. 61); the negation of the Constantinopolitan patriarch's jurisdiction in Muscovy (1470), even though the pretext for the previous step—the reunion of Constantinople with Rome had been removed by the Ottoman conquest, constitute the milestones on the road of the Muscovite Church's progress towards "autocephaly"; cf. Ammann, *Abriss d.ostslaw.Kirchengesch.*, pp. 157-166; Denissoff, *Aux origines de l'Eglise russe autocéphale.*

[66] Zosimas of Moscow's charter setting up the paschal canon for the new millenary, *Pamjatniki drevne-russkago kanoničeskago prava*, pp. 795-802. The Metropolitan gives in a nutshell the newly formed Russian "historiosophic" schema: Constantine founded the "New Rome"; Vladimir brought Christianity to Russia; and now John III was the new Constantine of the new Constantinople-Moscow.

[67] *Russian Chronography of 1512*, in *Polnoe Sobranie Russkix Lětopisej*, XXII (1911), 258. It is possible, of course, that Constantinople is still meant here instead of Moscow (cf. Strémooukhoff, *Moscow the Third Rome*, p. 86, n. 13), but this seems somewhat less probable in view of the historical context. The 1512 redaction of the Chronography has been supposed to have Philotheus of Pskov for the author (cf. Strémooukhoff, p. 96-97).

[68] Malinin, *Starec Eleazarova monastyrja*, pp. 50-55; also "Poslanie starca Pskovskago Eleazarova monastyrja Filofeja k velikomu knjazju Vasiliju Ivanoviču," *Pravoslavnyj Sobesednik*, I (Kazan, 1863), 343-344.—Philotheus' other epistles contain fragments of the same theory; the work purporting to be his epistle to John IV (Malinin, pp. 57-66) further elaborates it by comparing the Church to the Woman clothed in the sun of the Apocalypse, and the wilderness into which she fled (*Apoc.* 12:6) to Russia, which thereupon became her sole abode. The same idea is expressed allegorically in the Novgordian legend of the White *Klobuk* (ecclesiastical headgear), whose authorship and exact date are still a matter of dispute, but which seems to have some connection with the pro-Muscovite Archbishop of Novgorod, Gennadius (1485-1504). It is concerned with the transmission of a piece of Byzantine ecclesiastical insignia from Rome to Constantinople, and thence to the "Third Rome": "for in the Third Rome, which is in the Russian land, the grace of the Holy Ghost shone forth" (*Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury*, ed. G. Kuželev-Bezborodko, I [St. Petersburg, 1860], 296; cf. Strémooukhoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-92).—The development of the "Third Rome" idea was further stimulated by the struggle of the Muscovite Establishment with Catholic influence from abroad and the heresy of the Judaizers within; by the activities of the "Josephian" party of churchmen; and by the apocalyptic preoccupations of the

The Church of Old Rome fell because of the impiety of the Apollinarian heresy;[69] the Church of the Second Rome, Constantinople, was smitten under the battle-axes of the Agarenes; but this present Church of the Third, New Rome, of Thy sovereign empire: the Holy Catholic[70] Apostolic Church . . . shines in the whole universe more resplendent than the sun. And let it be known to Thy Lordship, O pious Czar, that all the empires of the Orthodox Christian Faith have converged into Thine one empire. Thou art the sole Emperor of all the Christians in the whole universe. . . . For two Romes have fallen, and the Third stands, and a fourth shall never be, for Thy Christian Empire shall not devolve upon others. . . .

---

age—all of which lies beyond the scope of this paper, but for which see, e.g., Schaeder, *Moskau das dritte Rom;* Strémooukhoff, *op. cit.;* Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome,* pp. 78-98; Ammann, *Abriss d.ostslaw.Kirchengesch.,* pp. 153-183. The literary sources of Philotheus are re-examined by Strémooukhoff, esp. pp. 96-101; the contemporaneous influence of the caesaropapist Deacon Agapetus's *Exposition* of the duties of princes (A.D. 527) is dealt with in Ševčenko, *Neglected Byz.Source of Muscov.Pol.Ideology.*

[69] The puerile argument of the followers of Cerularius against the Latin use of unleavened bread in the liturgy was that, whereas the leavened bread of the Byzantine rite was (symbolically speaking) "animated," that of the Latins was "dead" (cf. Nicetas Stethatus, in Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios,* II, 321-322). From this accusation stemmed another: that the use of unleavened bread implied the Catholic Church's profession of the heresy of Apollinaris of Laodicea; Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin,* p. 207, n. 4, 373-376. For the Byzantine attacks on the Catholic Church in general see A. Palmieri, "De Orientalium in schismate defendendo peccatis," *Acta Academiae Velehradensis,* I-III (1912); for Apollinarism and its negation of the human soul of Our Lord see the most recent study by A. Grillmeier, S.J., "Die theologische und sprachliche Vorbereitung der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon," in Grillmeier-Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon,* I (Würzburg, 1951), 5-202, esp. 102-120.

[70] The Russian word is *sobornaja,* translating, from about the fourteenth century, *καθολική,* in lieu of the old *kafoličeskaja* (cf., e.g., A. Gezen, *Istorija slavjanskago perevoda Simvola Věry* [St. Petersburg, 1884]). The adjective *sobornyj* (from *sobirat',* "to gather together") is an ambiguous one, for besides translating "catholic" (an obsolete use now, save in the Creed) it denotes also that which pertains to a council (*sobor*). Since the days of Xomjakov, and under Western influences, much has been said in Russia, especially by the Slavophiles, on the *sobornost'* of the Church; in our own day, S. Bulgakov and N. Berdjaev have expounded this ultra-spiritualist and yet chauvinist transcription in ecclesiological terms of the doctrine of popular sovereignty. However interesting this idea may be, it is grounded in a rather humorless play on words resulting from the comparative poverty of early-Slavic terminology. It is curious that the above adjective should have been transcribed as "synodal" in Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome,* p. 93 etc.

For reasons to be examined later, the official attitude of the last Muscovite Rurikids (1462-1598) fell short of such contemporaneous proclamations of the *translatio* as came from the ecclesiastical quarters. It was also less "historiosophic." The official ideology that can be elicited from state documents and state ceremonies merely asserted an imperial status as inherent in the Rurikid sovereignty of "All Russia" and as only remotely derived from the "Second Rome" through the fictitious transfer of imperial regalia to Vladimir II Monomakh.[71] Yet in context with another series of events this official ideology of the statesmen can be shown to contain hidden within itself claims to no less, but actually to even more than did its unofficial counterpart of the ecclesiastics: not the "Byzantine inheritance" only, but that of the two former imperial overlords of Muscovy, the Golden Horde as well as the "New Rome."

The first event was, of course, the marriage in 1472 of John III, Grand Duke of Muscovy, to Zoe-Sophia Palaeologina, a niece of the last Eastern Emperor,[72] who with a fine disregard for the Roman constitutional theory[73] and for her genealogical position[74]

[71] The "lay" Muscovite political doctrine has been analyzed in Olšr, *Gli ultimi Rurikidi*. Cf. *infra*, nn. 76, 92, 97.

[72] The betrothal, or marriage by proxy, took place at St. Peter's in Rome, 1 June, 1472; the second ceremony, with John III in person, was in Moscow, 12 November, 1472; Pierling, *La Russie et l'Orient: Mariage d'un tsar au Vatican—Ivan III et Sophie Paléologue* (Paris, 1891), pp. 48-53, 78-80, 192-200; *La Russie et le Saint -Siège*, pp. 150-153, 171-172; cf. A. Papadopoulos, *Versuch einer Genealogie der Palaiologen, 1259-1453* (Munich, 1938), Gen. Table etc.; Baumgarten, "Généalogies des branches régnantes des Rurikides du XIII[e] au XVI[e] siècle," *Orientalia Christiana*, XXXV (1934), 18, 21 (where the date 1473 must be a *lapsus calami*).—Brought up in Rome and as a Catholic, in the tradition of the Union of Florence, Zoe passed to Greek-Orthodoxy in Muscovy. For this, and for the embroiling duplicity of Gian-Battista della Volpe, *alias* Ivan Frjazin, the intermediary between the Vatican and the Kremlin in negotiating the marriage, see Pierling, *op. cit.*

[73] Although the later Byzantines evinced a certain "legitimist" dynastic feeling, theoretically the imperial power remained non-hereditary, the desired succession being ensured through co-optation; cf. J. B. Bury, *The Constitution of the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1910); Bréhier, *Institutions*, pp. 17-26.

[74] Zoe was the *youngest* of the four surviving children of the Despot Thomas Palaeologus; her brother Andrew, who styled himself Emperor, died in 1502, and her sister Helen, Queen of Serbia, in 1473, leaving through two of her daughters, Milizza (wife of Leonardo III Tocco) and Irene (wife of Giovanni Castriota), a posterity which has survived to our day; cf. Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*; C. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues* (Berlin, 1873), pp. 530-531, 533, etc.

was regarded as the "heiress of the Empire."[75] The second event was the overthrow by the same John III, in 1480, of the last vestiges of the Horde's suzerainty. Immediately following the first event, John assumed—unofficially—the title of emperor (czar),[76] hitherto belonging, in the Russian eyes, *par excellence* to the Byzantine and Mongol rulers.[77] John also took the bicephalous imperial eagle for his

[75] This spurious right of Zoe's has been acclaimed for the last five centuries, from the letter of the Republic of Venice to John III, of 4 December 1473 (cf. Pierling, *Russie et l'Orient*, pp. 202-203), to the late F. Uspenskij's posthumous *Istorija Vizantijskoj imperii*, III (Moscow/Leningrad, 1948), 797. Cf. Pierling, pp. 148, 153-154.

[76] Olšr, *Gli ultimi Rurikidi*, pp. 327-329; S. M. Solov'ëv, *Istorija Rossii s drevnějšix vremen*, I (St. Petersburg, 1894), 1483 (first occurrence of the title: in 1473); cf. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, pp. 76-77; Vernadsky, *Mongols*, p. 385; V. Kluchevsky, *A History of Russia*, trans. C. J. Hogarth, II (London/New York, 1912), 20.—Fr. Olšr has shown that, until John IV at least, the title of Czar (*car'*) was used unofficially and vaguely, chiefly for the benefit of foreigners ("Grand *Prince*" or "Grand *Duke*" being capable of implying a vassalage vis-à-vis the Western Emperor), and (he argues) without the definite implications of the Byzantine unique cosmocrator; *op. cit.*, pp. 327-329, 334, 340-342. The really significant title was that of *Velikij Gosudar'* ("Great Sovereign"), which signified that Muscovy was a great Power; *ibid.*, pp. 330-334. Yet, though vague and unofficial, "Czar" *did* translate βασιλεύς (*infra*, n. 77), and in the official acts, such as the coronation ceremony of 1498 (*infra*, n. 79), the references to the Muscovite sovereign's position as Czar [= *basileus*] of Greek Orthodox Christendom [= *oikoumene*] can only be construed, as Medlin indicates (pp. 79, 104), as implying the Byzantine succession—let alone the fact that, beginning with that of 1498, all the Muscovite coronation ceremonies were borrowed from Byzantium. That John III sought the Western Emperor's recognition of equality need not militate against that implication. After all, subjective universality had made the Byzantine cosmocracy a mere "microcosmocracy"; and the Basilid Emperors, while claiming to be the "pneumatic" fathers of the other monarchs of their *oikoumene*, did recognize some of the greater among those of the "outside" as their "pneumatic" *brothers*; cf. *supra*, n. 41.

[77] East-Slavic and South-Slavic *car'* is the equivalent of βασιλεύς; its generally accepted derivation from "Caesar" through the Bulg. *cesar* has been somewhat put in question by Vernadsky who would suggest for it an Iranian origin; *Ancient Russia*, pp. 253-254. As β. had become for the Byzantines primarily the imperial title, so *car'* was for the Russians κατ' ἐξοχήν the title of the Byzantine and Mongol emperors; cf. Vernadsky, *Mongols*, pp. 385, 153. Nevertheless, *car'* continued to be used for kings of biblical and classical associations (such, e.g., as those of Egypt or Georgia), for they were felt to be a part of the Byzantine microcosmic *oikoumene*; Western kings, who were "outside," were given the title of *korol'* (derived from Charlemagne and a functional equivalent of the Byz. ῥήξ), while the Western Emperor was styled *cesar'*. Cf. *supra*, n. 15.—It was possibly in its biblical-classical connotation, natural

arms,[78] and adopted the Byzantine system of collegial sovereignty and Byzantine ceremonial of coronation.[79] Following the second event, John assumed the Byzantine title of "Autocrat"[80] and attempted to maintain his imperial status on an international scale.[81] His grandson, John IV the Terrible, and the latter's son, the last Muscovite Rurikid Theodore I, brought to a triumphant conclusion both the open and the covert stream of Muscovite "Third-Romism." John IV had himself officially crowned czar in 1547[82] and then proclaimed his succession to the Golden Horde through the conquest of two of its successor-states, Kazan (in 1552) and Astrakhan (in 1556).[83] Under Theodore, the Primate of Russia was elevated in 1589 to the rank of a patriarch, replacing the "fallen" Patriarch of Rome.[84] All the imperial inher-

---

with ecclesiastical writers, that the monk Thomas addressed Boris, Grand Duke of Tver' († 1461), rival of Moscow, as *car'*; on the other hand, Tver' may have been regarded by her children as the natural destination of the *translatio imperii*, instead of Trnovo or Moscow; cf. Ševčenko, *Neglected Byz. Source of Muscov. Pol.Ideology*, pp. 154-156.

[78] Cf. Kluchevsky, *History*, II, 21; Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, plate 1.

[79] John III co-opted, first, his grandson Demetrius and, then, his second son Basil (III); cf. Olšr, "La Chiesa e lo Stato nel ceremoniale d'incoronazione degli ultimi sovrani Rurikidi," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, XVI (1950), pp. 278-289; Medlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-80; and, for collegial sovereignty, my art. "The Fifteenth-Century Bagratids and the Institution of Collegial Sovereignty in Georgia," *Traditio*, VII, 204-209. In view of what has been said *supra*, n. 76, and of the fact that in the coronation of 1498 Demetrius was proclaimed *Grand Duke (blagoslavljaju velikim knjažstvom; na velikoe knjažstvo blagoslovil;* in *Sobranie gosudarstvennyx gramot i dogovorov*, II [Moscow, 1819], No. 25), it is impossible to accept Strémooukhoff's assertion that John III officially assumed the title of Czar and that he bestowed it upon Demetrius (*Moscow the Third Rome*, p. 99).

[80] *Samoderžec* = αὐτοκράτωρ; cf. Vernadsky, *Mongols*, p. 385; Kluchevsky, *History*, II, 20; Medlin, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

[81] Olšr, *Gli ultimi Rurikidi*, pp. 330-340.—Muscovite diplomacy began to funciton regularly under John III. Schooled in the Mongol conceptions of etiquette and imbued with exaggerated notions of their country's importance, which they sought to translate in terms of diplomatic ceremonial, Muscovite diplomats caused no end of trouble to many a Western *chef de protocole;* cf. Pierling, *Russie et l'Orient*, pp. 115-132; Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 387-389.

[82] Olšr, *op. cit.*, pp. 342, 350-366; Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, pp. 99-104.

[83] Vernadsky, *Mongols*, pp. 387-389; cf. Olšr, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

[84] Ammann, *Abriss d.ostslaw.Kirchengesch.*, pp. 230-242; cf. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, pp. 115-118; Spačil, *Conceptus et doctrina de Ecclesia*, pp. 67-68.—On this occasion Philotheus' schema of the "Third Rome" is restated almost *verbatim* by Jeremias II of Constantinople; *Sobranie gos.gramot i dogov.*, II, 97.

itances known to Russia had now converged to form the Muscovite realm of "All Russia."

The reasons for the official reticence about the "Byzantine inheritance" on the part of the Muscovite government are not far to seek. They were both political and psychological. Politically, that inheritance had become a slogan with which the West, with its perennial lack of insight into the Russian realities, endeavored to draw Muscovy into an anti-Ottoman—anti-Muslim—crusade. But Muscovy had her own Muslim policy—one of a diametrically opposite orientation, and had no intention of quarrelling with Islam.[85] First of all, prior to 1480, she was still—albeit in pure theory—a Muslim sovereign's vassal and had become his hopeful heir.[86] She, moreover, greatly benefited by her alliance with another Muslim State, the Crimea, enemy alike of Lithuania, Muscovy's rival in the gathering of "All Russia," and of the Golden Horde. Then, in 1478, the Khan of the Crimea became a vassal of the Ottoman Sultan. With the newly risen Ottoman Empire, Muscovy had no desire to be at odds; in fact, she sought, and in 1492 obtained, through the mediation of the Crimean ally, an inauguration of friendly relations with the Porte.[87] In this connection, Muscovite Russia was not averse to posing as something of a "Muslim Power."[88] This political system of collaboration with Islam might have been upset by any overt reference to the "Byzantine inheritance" with all its implications. When, finally, after the conquest of Kazan and Astrakhan, the Crimean alliance was ended, the Khanate long remained a serious menace to Muscovy from the south, which would only have been enhanced by additional Ottoman hostility.[89]

[85] Cf. Pierling, *Russie et l'Orient*, pp. 133-158; *Papes et Tsars*, pp. 1-26; *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, pp. 311-315.

[86] Already prior to the formal overthrow of the Horde's suzerainty, Basil II of Muscovy set up in 1452/3 a Tatar khanate (*carstvo*=kingdom, "empire") of Gorodec or Kasimov under a Genghisid prince (Qasim ibn Muḥammad) and vassal to himself; Vernadsky, *Mongols*, pp. 331-332.

[87] A good outline of these relations will be found in O. Halecki, *Borderlands of Western Civilization* (New York, 1952), pp. 142-146; cf. Pierling, *Russie et l'Orient*, pp. 135-140; Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 314-332.

[88] In 1570, John IV's envoy to Constantinople, Novosil'cov, assured the Sultan that the Czar was not an enemy of Islam; and John the Terrible wrote to Selim II the Sot that the Muslims enjoyed a perfect liberty in Muscovy; cf. Pierling, *Papes et Tsars*, p. 98 (= *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, p. 392).

[89] Cf. Kluchevsky, *History*, II, 112-113.

Psychologically, Muscovy and her rulers must have felt the need of assuaging the memory of the frightful degradation of Mongol rule.[90] Inferiority complexes breed superiority airs;[91] and the claims to a recent *translatio* must have seemed as unsatisfactory psychologically to Moscow, inebriated with the consciousness of her newly found power, as they were imprudent politically. The fiction of an inherent imperial quality of the Rurikid dynasty, as "by ancient law established," was, evidently, more satisfying; but since some legal basis still had to be given for it, the *translatio* was, indeed, admitted, but at the same time pushed into a remote past.[92]

Quite obviously, official statements cannot be taken as the sole data for the ideological development of a nation, especially when there

[90] The authority of the Rurikid princes was greatly limited by Mongol suzerainty; it was, moreover, entirely dependent on the Khan's appointment (*jarlyq*) and revocable at will. The suzerain of the Rurikids, the Khan of the Golden Horde (more properly: "White Horde"; cf. Vernadsky, *Mongols*, pp. 138-140), or in Russian: *car' Ordynskij*, was himself a vassal of the Great Khan. The princes were obliged to present themselves before their overlord and to proffer signs of submission which included the kotow; Vernadsky, pp. 144-145, 214-232, 344, 354-355, 357-358.

[91] Already Fr. Antonio Possevino, S.J., so analyzed Muscovite hauteur; cf. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 385.

[92] Muscovy's newly achieved position of a great Power was thus projected into the past, to the very foundations of Rurikid Russia. We have already seen the claim that the *translatio* occurred under Vladimir II (*supra*, at n. 71): this was referred to in the coronation ceremonies of 1547, 1584, and 1613; *Sobranie gos.gramot i dogov.*, II, Nos. 33, 51; I (1813), No. 203; *Dopolnenija k aktam istoričeskim*, I (St. Petersburg, 1846), No. 39; *Polnoe Sobranie Russk.Lětop.*, XIII, 1 (1904), 450-451; cf. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, pp. 101-102, 114, 134. On this basis the crown of Muscovy (apparently a gift of a Khan of the Golden Horde) came to be known as *šapka Monomaxova;* Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 386. Another legend pushed the *translatio* farther back to St. Vladimir I, the first Christian prince († 1015) and husband of the Porphyrogenita Anna; thus, the charter of the Constantinopolitan patriarch Joasaph II, of 1561, recognizing John IV's title of Czar, made mention of his descent from the Blood Imperial (*Russkaja Istoričeskaja Biblioteka*, XXII, 2 [St. Petersburg, 1908], 67-75), and the Apostolic Vladimir was referred to in coronation ceremonies; *Dopolnenia k akt.ist.*, I, No. 145 (1598); *Sobranie gos.gramot i dogov.*, I, No. 203; cf. Medlin, pp. 118-119, 134. Fr. Olšr (*Gli ultimi Rurikidi*, pp. 342-348) minimizes perhaps too much (in the face of Mme. Schaeder and Malinin) the element of the "Byzantine inheritance" in these two legends. This projection back of the *translatio* indeed conferred upon the Rurikids an imperial status as "from of old"; yet in both cases the Byzantine basis of that status is inescapable. It may be noted in passing that the genealogical argument of both

are reasons to suspect these statements of having been deliberately watered down. So, undeterred by official reserve, the ideology of "Third-Romism" continued to mold the *Weltanschauung* of the Muscovites. And, later on, under the upstarts, the Godunovs and the Romanovs, who followed the Rurikids on the throne, but who could not lay claims to any such dynastic self-sufficiency as the latter had evinced, and in whose day the Tatar yoke was long past and the Crimean and Ottoman menace less formidable, the basic ideology of the "Third Rome" threw off its official veils.[93]

There was, in this ideology, a slight inconsistency, given the premises—one of having the *translatio imperii* to Moscow and still admitting the ecclesiastical primacy of Constantinople, even after the creation of the Muscovite patriarchate. It implied the co-existence of two subjective and microcosmic *oikoumenai*: the purely Muscovite of the "oecumenical" czar and the pan-Greek-Orthodox of the "Oecumenical Patriarch."[94] But in the excitement of the discovery of the new idea, its inner contradiction was not perceived by the Russians of the sixteenth century. To them, "Holy Russia" was indeed the *oikoumene*, with its own Caesar and Patriarch and matrix of empire—Moscow the "Third Rome." This subjectively-oecumenical, national-Orthodox *corpus politicum mysticum* was in the eyes of its denizens the only

---

legends is unfounded. The Rurikids did not descend from St. Vladimir's Byzantine marriage (cf. Baumgarten, *Généalogies*, p. 7)and the connection of Vladimir II's mother with Constantine IX Monomachus (whose surname he assumed) is undeterminable (Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *Primary Chronicle*, n. 192 [p. 263]). It is interesting to see to what an extent the formulators of these high claims—beginning with John III who refused the royal crown offered by the Western Emperor and asserted that his predecessors had lived on terms of brotherhood and amity with the Eastern Emperors (*Pamjatniki diplomatičeskix snošenij drevnej Rusi s deržavami inostrannymi*, I [St. Petersburg, 1851], 17)—appeared oblivious of the Rurikids' recent abject position vis-à-vis not only the Mongols (cf. *supra*, n. 90), but also the Byzantines, in whose eyes their head, the Grand Duke, had not rated as more than a mere Master of the Table at the imperial Court; cf. Vasiliev, *Was Old Russia a Vassal State of Byzantium?*, pp. 353-354; Olšr, pp. 331-333.

[93] For this increase of Byzantinism see Medlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-121, 133-134, 145, 148. It was only under the first Romanovs that Muscovy entered into a military conflict with the Ottomans and that it began seriously to speak of a crusade and—an integral part of the "Byzantine inheritance"—the drive towards Constantinople; cf. C. de Grunwald, *Trois siècles de diplomatie russe* (Paris, 1945), pp. 17-22.

[94] Cf. Medlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-118.

microcosm of the universe. The inherent caesaropapism of this world was intensified by the writings and activities of the "Josephian" party of churchmen.[95]

Several other fictions were used to enhance and embellish this "Russian Idea." Among them was the legend of the apostolate in Russia of St. Andrew the "First-Called";[96] and the equally telling claim of the Rurikid house to be descended from an imaginary brother of Caesar Augustus.[97] More revealing still, though not to the Muscovites themselves, were the two "historiosophic" *Tales of the Kingdom of Babylon* demonstrating Moscow's position at the summit of the drama of history by tracing, in the spirit of Daniel's visions, the imperial power of her predecessor Byzantium, beyond Rome, back to Babylon.[98] To the early Church—the new Israel—pagan and monistic

[95] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 78-121. In the coronation of 1584, Muscovy was proclaimed to be an "angelic image of the Kingdom of Heaven"; *Sobranie gos.gramot i dogov.*, II, No. 51, p. 75; cf. Medlin, pp. 114-115; and *supra*, n. 28. For Muscovite caesaropapism, see Medlin, esp. pp. 104-124, 147-148, etc.

[96] The false apostolicity of the see of Constantinople reposed on the legend of its founding by St. Andrew, which appeared in the sixth century (cf., e.g., Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin*, p. 22). He was also claimed by mediaeval Georgia as her first illuminator (cf. my *Christian Caucasia*, § 11); finally, in the eleventh century, he was believed to have journeyed in what was to be Russia (this legend was incorporated into the *Primary Chronicle*, cf. trans. and ed. Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, pp. 53-54 and n. 39 [pp. 223-224]), and, in the sixteenth (*Chronography of 1512*, pp. 346 f.), he was said to have preached there; cf. Ammann, *Abriss d.ostslaw.Kirchengesch.*, pp. 10-11.

[97] The *Account of the Princes of Vladimir* (*Skazanie o knjaz'jax Vladimirskix*), composed under South Slavic influences *c.* 1480/1523, contains for the first time (1) the above claim, and (2) the story of the transmission of the imperial regalia from Constantine IX Monomachus (1042-1055) to Vladimir II (1113-1125; the anachronism did not at first embarrass the Muscovite politico-religious theorists, but later Constantine was replaced by Alexius I; for the transmission, cf. *supra*, nn. 71, 92). The first claim was much used by John IV and referred to in the coronation ceremonies of the first Romanov, in 1613 (*Sobranie gos.gramot i dogov.*, I, No. 203, 599); the story of the transmission inspired, *c.* 1523, the monk Spiridon-Sabbas to compose an Epistle on the subject; cf. I. Zdanov, *Russkij bylevoj ěpos* (St. Petersburg, 1895), pp. 1-151 (contains an edition of the *Skazanie*); N. Gudzij, *Istorija drevnej russkoj literatury* (Moscow, 1945), pp. 252-259.—Moscow did "protest too much": it is amusing to see her endeavors to make her self-assumed caesaro-papal position doubly secure by claiming not only a *translatio* from the "Second Rome," but also a parallel succession from the *brothers* of the first Emperor and of the first Pope.

[98] The Tales, composed probably at the end of the fifteenth century, treat of the discovery and transmission to Byzantium of the imperial regalia of

Rome was, indeed, another Babylon. Of this Babylonian aspect of imperial Rome, Constantinople was the indisputable heir; thus Moscow earned the appellation, given her in our own day, of the "Fourth Babylon."[99] It is of the nature of the dynamic of "Neo-Romism," both Byzantine and Muscovite, to attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable inheritances of Babylon and of Jerusalem,[100] of imperialism and of messianism.

Muscovy, accordingly, was now invested with the awesome and messianic duty of the sole dispenser of orthodoxy in the world. And, just as the subjective universality of the Roman Empire did not deter it from expanding over that which lay outside its boundaries, so now the co-extension of Greek Orthodoxy with the Muscovite world signified the latter's expansionist outburst, directed in the first place toward all the lands of the Greek Orthodox microcosm. Thus, exactly as Constantinople had endeavored to bring within her sphere her envied prototype, so now to inherit the "Second Rome" was not the least of the duties of the Third.

Soon, however, the seemingly harmonious dream of the Muscovite divines and statesmen was subjected to two rude shocks, before being completely transformed in the Petersburgian period. One shock came in connection with the ecclesiastical reforms of the Patriarch Nicon. They caused, in the seventeenth century, the above-mentioned contradiction implied in that dream to manifest itself in an internecine strife. It was the struggle of those who, taking *au pied de la lettre* the dream of the "Third Rome," believed in the perfection of their Muscovite *oikoumene*, and those who, failing to find that perfection in the dreary and squalid realities of Muscovite Russia, sought to

---

Babylon. They appear to be of Byzantine origin, whereas the *Account of the Princes of Vladimir* (*supra*, n. 97) is their Muscovite continuation and conclusion. Cf. Zdanov, *loc. cit.* (contains also an edition of the Tales); Gudzij, *loc. cit.* For the Muscovite preoccupation with what was deemed to be scriptural evidence for imperial history (especially Daniel and the Apocalypse), see Strémooukhoff, *Moscow the Third Rome;* Schaeder, *Moskau das dritte Rom.*

[99] A. H. Armstrong, "The Fourth Babylon," *The Tablet* (London), 25 August 1945.

[100] In addition to claiming the Babylonian-Byzantine inheritance, the Rurikids and their Muscovite successors insisted—like any other Christian kings, as a matter of fact—on their spiritual succession to the Kings of Israel. References to this "Israelite succession" are found, e.g., in the coronation ceremonies of 1498, 1547, 1584, 1598, 1613; cf. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, pp. 79, 101-102, 114, 120, 133, also 57-60.

attain it, at least in the ecclesiastical sphere, by correcting Russian abuses by Greek models. It was, to a certain extent, the old polarity of urges, to and away from Byzantium, come to the fore. With the crown's support, the broader conception was victorious. Without it, Nicon's attempt also to revive somewhat the long-lost notion of the primacy of the spiritual proved an utter failure.[101]

The second blow was dealt by the iconoclastic westernization instituted by Peter the Great, which seemed to shatter the Muscovite dreams.[102] Yet Peter's activity did not destroy the old idea; it merely transcribed it in secularist terms. Exactly in the same way, the conversion of Constantine had merely veneered, without altering, the inherent societal monism of the Roman State. The irrational current which any impartial historian can detect in the foreign policy of the Russian Empire after Peter the Great, imperialism for its own sake, Greek projects, the drive to the Balkans and on to Constantinople—all this can be regarded as a manifestation of the permanence of the idea of Moscow the Third Rome. To be sure, the "brother-Orthodox" came to be spoken of as "brother-Slavs" with Russian imperialist messianism undergoing a transcription into the racist terms of Panslavism, and, instead of the co-extension of Russia with Greek Orthodoxy, a co-extension of Russia with Slavdom was sought. But it was the same old idea that gave all its vigor to what has been called Russia's "permanent mission."[103] With it survived, too, the inner contradiction of claiming the succession both of Babylon and of Sion, as that dialectic of aggression and of persecution complex which characterizes Russia's attitude toward the "outside."

Even today, the dominant Marxist ideology of Russia has not destroyed the ancient tradition. It has merely merged its own antagonism to religion and its expansionist materialistic millennarianism with the hatred of the True Rome and messianic expansionism inherent in the "Third Rome."

Georgetown University

[101] The Niconian upheaval and its immediate background are ably treated in Medlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-210; Ammann, *Abriss d.ostslaw.Kirchengesch*, pp. 247-289.

[102] Cf. Ammann, *op. cit.*, pp. 363-388; Medlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 211-223.

[103] H. Kohn, "The Permanent Mission," *The Review of Politics*, X (1948), 267-289; cf. also *idem*, *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology* (Notre Dame, 1953), chap. II, 101-179 and pp. 225-252; N. Riasanovsky, *Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles* (Cambridge, Mass., 1952).

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

Jew and Greek. By Dom Gregory Dix. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1954. Pp. vii, 119. $2.50.)

The manuscript of this short study of the primitive Church was left unfinished by Dom Gregory Dix when death overtook him in May, 1952. The Anglican religious, on his death bed, had not considered this uncompleted work worthy of publication. Canon H. J. Carpenter, the editor, however, did not agree with the author, and published the study "with very little editorial work." Part of this editorial work was to give the study a new title. The original manuscript had carried the title: "The Problem of the sub-Apostolic Church." The "problem" to the author was the "identity" of the historic Catholic Church with the primitive apostolic community. "It would be generally agreed," said Dom Gregory, "that there was 'continuity' of some kind and 'development' of some kind in the life of the Church between *c.* A.D. 50 and *c.* A.D. 150. But did the 'development' at some point so transform the Church as to make it henceforth a *different* sort of thing, so that the 'continuity' was no more than formal?"

That question the author does not answer, and probably for this reason the editor has seen fit to change the title to its present form. Indeed, after stating that "the subject of the following discussion will therefore be the problem of the legitimacy of the sub-Apostolic Church as we obscurely glimpse it, say *c.* A.D. 100 in the writings of Clement and Ignatius," the author engages in a long and interesting discussion of the constant conflict between the Syriac and Greek cultures, and of the transition in the early Church from Jewish to Gentile predominance, without, however, coming conclusively to the announced point of issue, and without quoting from the writings of Clement or Ignatius. Had the author been able to finish the work himself he probably would have reached the focal point of his study.

As it now stands, the essay is really made up of three chapters. In the first chapter the author expertly traces the centuries-old conflict between the "Hellenic" and "Syriac" cultures. The term "Syriac" culture, borrowed from Toynbee, is used to signify the culture often termed "Oriental," of which Judaism is a particular form. For centuries before Christ these cultures had been in conflict, with their adherents often appealing to arms to settle the dispute. But the real conflict was one of ideas. The Hellenic mind attempted to explain the origin of the world and of man in terms of the universe itself, whereas the Syriac mind, as exemplified by Judaism

went beyond the universe to the "Living God" for the ultimate explanation of human life. It was a battle between those who trusted in the world and those who trusted in God.

In the second chapter Dom Gregory traces the Jewish influence in the early Church, while in the third chapter he shows how quickly the Gentile element became dominant in the Church. This quick change he attributes almost solely to the decision on circumcision taken by the apostles at the Council of Jerusalem around A.D. 50. It is here that the author fails to tackle the heart of the problem, viz., whether, when the Gentile Christians became dominant, they brought about such a change in the Church that it could be called "another" Church. From what the author actually says, it would seem that he saw no such radical change. For the only "change" he discusses is the possible rearrangement of the Jewish-Christian rite of the Eucharist. Besides this merely liturgical "change," he discusses no other; he mentions no "change" in doctrine. Hence the only conclusion he could have been led to make (but he does not make it) is that, when the Gentile Christians outnumbered and supplanted in authority the Jewish Christians, the Catholic Church did not become "different" from the Church of earlier apostolic times; in other words, there was no break in continuity. The essay really ends with the third chapter. The editor, from conversations with Dom Gregory before his death, added an appendix which deals with the authorship and authority of the Gospel of St. Mark. This appendix appears almost irrelevant to the subject matter of the essay as originally outlined by the author.

This reviewer feels that the author makes some rather debatable, if not erroneous, statements and uses them in developing other points in his study. For example, it appears that he questions the historicity of *Acts* (p. 37); and he claims that the decision on circumcision given at the Council of Jerusalem did not satisfy Paul (p. 48). His dating of *Acts* is as debatable as another remark of his is strange, viz., that the "real difficulties of harmonising Acts with the Pauline Epistles are almost entirely those of *harmonising silences*." To harmonize silences is to work almost exclusively with the imagination, not with objective documents, as a serious historian should. To this critic it appears that the precise weakness of Dom Gregory's study lies in the fact that he did depend too much upon his imagination in drawing many of his conclusions—conclusions which lack the convincing power of more soundly proven statements. Perhaps the good religious was right, and his friends wrong, when he said, and they disagreed, that his manuscript was not yet ready for publication.

THOMAS B. FALLS

St. Charles Seminary
Overbrook

Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung Europas. By Theodor Schieffer. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag Herder. 1954. Pp. x, 326.)

Dr. Schieffer of Mainz has presented us with a thoughtful book in commemoration of the twelfth centennial of the martyrdom of St. Boniface in Frisia. The significance of this English Benedictine has not been fully realized until comparatively recent times. For centuries he was considered as only one of many missionaries. In fact, this is to our knowledge the first detailed analysis of the importance of his work. To make clear the place of Boniface, Dr. Schieffer reviews the history of the centuries preceding his advent and carries his study into the years of the great Carolingians. The entry of the Church upon the new western German world was as momentous as that of St. Paul, the apostle of the gentiles, upon the Hellenistic. He came from a province associated with a despised people who stubbornly clung to ideas that differed much from those commonly accepted as culturally proper. In the Hellenistic world the Church developed much of its philosophical and theological system and organization, neither of which it could boast when St. Paul expanded its mission. By the time Boniface preached it may, therefore, be called a well developed institution. That institution, however, was tied to the old that had been sadly shaken and much diminished by the conquests of Islam in the East and South. The Germans presented problems with which the popes, occupied as they were with the East and the difficulties it created for them, found it hard to cope. Then, too, the popes were harassed by the spread of the Church outside the towns. No longer could a bishop be chief pastor only of a city-state. The great landed proprietors and the monasteries often built churches and insisted on controlling them even to the point of installing the priests. Episcopal powers were limited. On their plane, too, the Germanic kings tended to control the Church in their dominions to the disadvantage of a Church under the popes. The end would be a disrupted Church.

Nowhere were the new German institutions purer than in England where there had been no thorough-going Romanization of the people, Celtic or German. Boniface grew up amid this Engilsh order at a time when Wessex had not yet completely established its leadership on the island. The religious culture with which he became familiar was the Roman Benedictine that had not long before asserted itself over the clan-type Irish with the bishop subject to the abbot. He came to know and to appreciate the necessity of a diocesan organization headed by the papacy. What he did not know when he left his homeland to convert his pagan kin on the continent he learned later from his visits to the Eternal City. Passing over the many other factors woven into the background picture by Dr. Schieffer, the Church in the West could benefit

the more from Boniface's activities because of Clovis' conversion to the orthodox faith and the later consolidation of the Frankish rule over the West by the Carolingians.

Thanks to the thorough synthesis of the history of the centuries preceding Boniface's work, the reader can appreciate his importance for the future of Europe more than was possible in the past. Just as thoroughly does the author follow Boniface year by year and land by land. Never forgetting the importance of background, he traces the missionary from Frisia into Alamannia and Bavaria and elsewhere. Everywhere Boniface stressed the unity and independence of the Church under the popes. After twenty years of priestly activity the papacy made (722) him a bishop and ten years later an archbishop, thus increasing his efficiency. Boniface could now speak and write with an authority he did not have before. Successes followed successes but not without hardships of many kinds. One is tempted to recount them all, but doing so would deprive our readers of the pleasure to be derived from Dr. Schieffer's story. Needless to say, we think his book should be translated not only for persons unfamiliar with the German tongue but also for those who prefer sound historical hagiographical writing. The author has appended a critical essay on his sources.

FRANCIS J. TSCHAN

Pennsylvania State University

Catherine of Siena. By Sigrid Undset. Translated by Kate Austin-Lund. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1954. Pp. vii, 293. $3.50.)

In the introduction to Sheed and Ward's new series, Makers of Christendom, Christopher Dawson, the general editor, points out that there are few even among Catholics who realize the importance of the lives of the saints for the history of western civilization; that nowhere else do we find such a rich tradition of authentic biographical material, which throws light on almost every aspect of life and thought over a period of 1900 years. No better illustration of Mr. Dawson's position could be found than the life of St. Catherine of Siena (1347-1380), whose most recent biography by Sigrid Undset develops with penetrating insight and literary skill both Catherine's contemplative and active life.

Catherine Benincasa in early childhood dedicated her life to God as the result of a mystic vision. After her reception as a sister of penitence of the Third Order of St. Dominic she lived a solitary religious life, practicing austerities at home and devoting herself to works of mercy in Siena. Catherine's reputation for holiness spread to other Italian city-

states and to Avignon, the residence of the pope during the so-called Babylonian Captivity. Catherine was called from her home to mediate controversies between individuals and powerful groups, to become a worker of miracles and a theological doctor. She lent strong support to several popes in such varied activities as the project of a new crusade, the mediation of peace with Florence, the return of the papacy to Rome, and an attempt to heal the papal schism. Few saints have lived such a busy life or been so occupied with problems of their time.

The chief concern of Sigrid Undset, however, is Catherine the saint. With dramatic impact Mme. Undset narrates the spiritual development of the great mystic. She believes that Catherine's extraordinary personality is timeless in its significance, and that this generation, which has seen the horrors of war and concentration camps, may understand more easily than our forefathers that we all have our share in the rewards of all the saints and the guilt of all the sinners.

Catherine of Siena was completed a few months before Sigrid Undset's death in 1949. This first translation into English is the skillful work of Kate Austin-Lund. Mme. Undset made use of the earliest biography of the saint, written by Blessed Raimondo of Capua, her confessor, friend, and associate, of Catherine's mystic work, *The Dialogue*, of her letters, and of her spiritual testament. The volume contains no bibliography, no index, and no chapter titles. As a work of literature it stands alone; as a work of history it is a valuable supplement to the earlier works in English of Scudder, Gardiner, and Jorgensen.

ANNA T. SHEEDY

College of New Rochelle

Wadding Papers, 1614-38. Edited by Brendan Jennings, O.F.M. (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, Stationery Office. 1953. Pp. xvi, 700. £ 3-3s.).

Father Luke Wadding was born at Waterford, Ireland, in 1588. He was educated in Portugal where he joined the Franciscans, and was ordained there in 1613. Sent to Rome as a member of a commission to promote the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, he remained there until his death in 1657. He was related to several Irish bishops and was a cousin of Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Armagh, who was president of the papal commission *De auxiliis divinis*. The patronage of influential cardinals and of the Spanish ambassadors enabled the famous Franciscan to found St. Isidore's College in 1625 and the Irish College for secular priests a few years later. He compiled the *Annales minorum* and *Scriptores ordinis minorum* and brought out an edition of the works of Duns Scotus.

As a consultor of the Holy Office, to which Irish ecclesiastical affairs were subject at the time, Wadding was one of the principal advisers on all questions referred to Rome from his native country. During the time of the Confederation of Kilkenny (1642 ff.) he devoted himself to the furtherance of Irish interests. Fortunately for history, he preserved all the letters which came to his hand. Amongst his correspondents were well known ecclesiastics and other important Irish notables of the period. All the Wadding Papers are now to be found in the Franciscan House of Studies at Killiney near Dublin. The Irish Historical Manuscripts Commission in dealing with these papers had focused attention on political affairs. The editor in the present volume presents the earlier letters treating principally of ecclesiastical events and in their original language—some of them had been published in translation but not always completely nor accurately. The time was critical for the Church. The numbers of the secular clergy had increased at the end of the hard pressures under Queen Elizabeth and they were able to take over much of the pastoral work which had been in the hands of the missionaries, especially the Franciscans. There was some friction but, as the editor remarks, it would be an error to think of that as widespread or important since the main body of the clergy, secular and regular, worked in harmony for the common good. An English priest residing in Dublin, Paul Harris, tried to exploit these incidents; he was aided and abetted by some of the French clergy until Rome finally established the truth in the matter. Many of the letters concern the appointment of bishops; in them we see the play of many interests, clerical and lay, those of the exiled Earls O'Neill and O'Donnell, of the courts of Spain and France.

In the correspondence there is evident the change in the method of governing the Irish Church—the bishops returned to their sees from the continent instead of ruling through vicars. The life of a bishop was fraught with danger and hardship. The English government made every effort to counter the exercise of their authority. They had no fixed income and had to depend upon the generosity of friends. Church lands had been confiscated and were in the hands of those who considered themselves the lawful owners on account of the dispensation granted by Cardinal Pole. The townsmen of Waterford were particularly ready to "eat the Church livings."

In general the condition of the Church was "poor and repressed." The people were deprived of the use of churches their fathers had built and they had to meet in private houses. Even when religion in the West enjoyed a temporary respite, the Franciscan chapel in Dublin was raided in 1629, giving notice that public worship was inadvisable, at least for the time. In Ulster the sacraments had to be administered secretly by the Franciscan priests who lived in hiding in the woods.

Bishop Patrick Comerford of Waterford gives a vivid description of the miseries of the people with the decay of trade and the inroads of famine which made him write that he "never thought to see such a state of things in the country," and were it not for the interests involved, he would in preference to his present position occupy the place of the lowliest lay brother in Wadding's College in Rome.

More than one half of the 384 letters are in Latin, about one-fifth are in English; the others are in Spanish and Italian; a few are in French and in Gaelic. More than 100 are addressed to Wadding himself. The printing and the binding are excellent. There is a very good index of names and places, enabling the reader easily to find the information he seeks. The introduction is enlightening. The editor, who has spent many years in research on the continent, deserves great commendation for putting this series of letters at the disposition of scholars.

MICHAEL J. HYNES

St. Luke's Rectory
Lakewood, Ohio

Prophecy and Papacy. A Study of Lamennais, the Church and the Revolution. By Alec R. Vidler. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1954. Pp. 300. $3.75.)

The little group of brilliant Catholics who wrote for *l'Avenir* and worked for the *Agence générale* in the early thirties of the last century intrigued many then, and they still do. Rohrbacher, Gerbet, de Coux, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and above all, the magnetic Lamennais were possible leaders of a vibrant Catholicism which might have re-Christianized France. When it is remembered that men like Victor Hugo, Lamartine, and Saint Beuve fell under the spell of the leader of this group, the remarkable Félicité de Lamennais, his downfall, tragic enough in itself, assumes the proportions of a catastrophe. The historian welcomes any study of Lamennais which throws light on the murky seas which caused his faith to come to shipwreck.

The Reverend Alexander Roper Vidler, Canon of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, has attempted to do this in *Prophecy and Papacy*. The book, an expansion of the Birkbeck Lectures which the author delivered at Cambridge in 1953, does not pretend to be a complete study of Lamennais. It comes to an end with the definitive apostasy of Lamennais which the author places in 1836. Canon Vidler makes it quite clear what he means by his title *Prophecy and Papacy*. By prophecy he means the stand of "those who believe themselves to be charged directly by God with a mis-

sion to declare the divine judgment on ecclesiastical corruption or to promote a more or less radical reformation or the adaptation of the church to a new historical environment." The author then opposes priesthood to prophecy, but, since he incarnates this priesthood in the person of Gregory XVI, the papacy of the titular antithesis is explained. By priesthood the author means the stand of "those who are or believe themselves to be responsible for maintaining the traditional doctrine and discipline and its hierarchical structure and cultus." Canon Vidler believes that both prophecy and priesthood are necessary for the Church, but that a certain amount of tension between them is unavoidable. In discussing Lamennais as the incarnation of prophecy the author displays commendable objectivity. He is not blind to the fiery Breton's faults, but he is deeply sympathetic. Indeed, though not a Roman Catholic himself, Canon Vidler seems to sense something of the tragedy of the lost faith of Lamennais. On the other hand, while somewhat critical of the way the pope handled Lamennais, Canon Vidler is aware of and appreciative of the genuine goodness of Gregory XVI.

In the epilogue in which the author sums up his reflections, Canon Vidler, although still quite fair, does not, it seems to this reviewer, completely understand the importance of context in judging papal documents. It also seems to this reviewer that there is a slight inaccuracy in Canon Vidler's analysis of *Mirari vos,* when he makes Gregory XVI say, "Pope Clement XIII held that the *only* way to deal with erroneous books is to burn them." (Italics the reviewer's.) What Gregory actually does make Clement XIII say is this: "We must combat with courage as the occasion itself requires and exterminate with all our strength the scourge of so many deadly books; the matter of error will never disappear if the criminal elements do not perish consumed by the flames." It is quite certain that Clement XIII, who was anything but a fool, believed in fighting false doctrine not only by burning bad books but by refuting the errors they contained. But these are small points which do not seriously impair the value of this interesting study.

JOSEPH S. BRUSHER

Loyola University
Los Angeles

La politique religieuse de Léopold 1er. By A. Simon. (Bruxelles: Ad. Goemare. 1953. Pp. 182.)

Professor Simon, in his latest study of the phases of the problem of Church and State in Belgium, has made a brief but penetrating analysis

of the religious policy of Leopold I. This book is written for Belgians, and for Belgians who are thoroughly familiar with the episodes in the struggle between Catholics and liberals which led to the formation of the Belgian Catholic Party. To an American reader, therefore, there are passages which are tantalizing in their allusions—to the "jurys universitaires" and the "affaire du Collège de la Paix," for example. Nevertheless, even without a clear knowledge of detail, the careful reader can follow the author's reasoning, and can check his conclusions.

According to M. Simon, the primary aim of King Leopold I was to keep Belgium in existence by giving it a conservative government which would unite men of all shades of political opinion. To accomplish this aim, he counted on using the hierarchy, which had been an important element in bringing about Belgium's independence. In order to strengthen the Catholic Church so that it would be able to achieve the end he desired, the Protestant Leopold used his royal prerogative in ways that his Catholic successors were unable to do. In spite of this, and of the support he received from the Holy See, Leopold failed to maintain a one-party nation. Catholics and liberals differed too widely to be able to unite on such matters as education and religious bequests. Leopold favored the new Catholic Party; but, unfortunately, by refusing his support to social-minded Catholic leaders, he caused the party to follow a conservative policy. This, Professor Simon argues, made many democratic Belgians who could not accept the economic theories of the liberals turn to the far left. In time they founded the aggressive Belgian Socialist Party.

Although the king failed in his immediate aims, he succeeded in doing something more important. First, he showed that in Belgium Church and State could co-exist harmoniously when "separation" was understood to mean true liberty for both parties. To gain freedom for the Church, he protected it against anti-religious legislation, and thereby helped to reconcile the Holy See to the constitutional governments of modern times.

Although Professor Simon may credit Leopold with too large a share in bringing about this change in Rome's attitude, his study deserves praise for drawing attention to a little noticed element in nineteenth-century Europe.

JANE MILLER

San Francisco College for Women

Pio IX e Vittorio Emanuele II dal loro carteggio privato: La questione Romana, 1856-1864. Parte prima: *Testo;* Parte seconda: *I Documenti.* By Pietro Pirri, S.J. [Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae, Volumes XVI and XVII.] (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana. 1951. Pp. xv, 599; xii, 332.)

In the course of his rather brief but pungent prefatory remarks, the learned author of this work calls the disintegration of the temporal power of the papacy "the most memorable event of the century." No one, of course, will gainsay the contention that the disintegration of the temporal power was a development of far-reaching importance. However, few historians will agree with Father Pirri that it was "the most memorable event" of the nineteenth century. The author is on more solid ground when he goes on to charge that certain historians of the Risorgimento have taken special pains to delineate Cardinal Antonelli in the most unflattering terms. They have sought, he notes, to depict this dynamic and able prelate, who became papal Secretary of State a few years after the advent of Pius IX and held that post until his death in 1876, as "a monstrous and repellent figure." Father Pirri is justified in maintaining that anyone who is willing to scrutinize Antonelli's work dispassionately and to judge it on the basis of authentic sources is bound to form a very different opinion of him. The cardinal's failure to preserve the territorial *status quo* in central Italy is also understandingly assessed by the author. According to Father Pirri, the cause which Antonelli served so faithfully and energetically was a hopeless one from the very outset. With the triumph of "nationalist individualism" and the "unbridled race toward expansionism," the old bond between the Catholic nations weakened. This, in turn, meant that the temporal power was doomed. Consequently, any other pope and any other papal Secretary of State, operating under circumstances such as these, would have found it equally impossible to ward off the fate which befell the States of the Church.

Judgments and conclusions of this type, however one may appraise them, bespeak a broad, interpretative approach and an awareness of the larger aspects and implications of the subject which the author is thus introducing. Actually, however—and this is certainly to be deplored—there is relatively little evidence of either such an approach or such an awareness in the several hundred pages of text that follow. In the main, the author contents himself with piecing together the contents of documents drawn from a number of sources, principally the archives of the papal secretariate of state. The result is a very detailed account of the diplomatic discussions and negotiations that constituted one of the most decisive chapters in the history of the celebrated Roman Question. A few words of elucidation are in order here. Although 1856 and 1864 appear in the

sub-title as the initial and terminal dates respectively, virtually the entire work is concerned with the sequence of events from the beginning of 1859 to the close of 1862; the anterior years are dealt with in nineteen pages. The developments of 1863 are presented in almost equally sketchy fashion, and those of the following year are not mentioned at all.

The author is unquestionably at his best when he is recounting successive *démarches* and their immediate repercussions. The treatment of the happenings which constitute his main preoccupation is careful and reasonably comprehensive. It is likewise, for the most part, solidly buttressed. Furthermore, despite occasional and unmistakable manifestations of partisanship, it is generally fair. All in all, Father Pirri's study, together with the material reproduced in the accompanying volume of documents, will prove a useful addition to the literature on the history of the Roman Question.

S. William Halperin

University of Chicago

Brother Potamian Educator and Scientist. By W. J. Battersby. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd. 1954. Pp. xi, 182. 15s.)

The life of Brother Potamian (Michael Francis O'Reilly), outstanding religious, educator, scientist, and man of letters of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, whose distinguished career ranged over two continents in the days of the conflict between Darwinian science and revealed religion, is of scholarly interest. Born in Ireland in 1846, the opening year of the famine, and thrown upon American shores before he was a year old, he began his schooling with the Christian Brothers at St. Brigid's, one of the parishes established in New York for a nation fleeing from the failure of nature and the terror of misgovernment. At thirteen he entered the brothers' novitiate at Montreal, was teaching within a year, and at nineteen was vice principal of the brothers' academy. Five years later he was summoned from St. Louis to Clapham to pioneer high school education for the rising Catholic middle classes of London. Here with incomparable intelligence, energy, and zeal he met every demand of teaching and school administration. Meanwhile he built Tooting College, organized a magnificent display of the educational exhibits of the brothers' schools for the International Health Exhibition of 1884, won the doctorate in science from the University of London, wrote a life of John Baptist de la Salle, and published numerous articles in scientific journals. His answer to the Darwinians is illuminating:

> Scientific truth is eminently beautiful because it is an emanation of the Divine Intellect of Him who created the world and fixed the wisdom of its laws.

Throughout his career Brother Potamian kept abreast of the extraordinary advance in science, and in 1896 we find him demonstrating the use of a microphone of his own invention to the students of Waterford Training College and providing one of the first practical applications of X-ray. His last twenty-five years were spent at Manhattan College where he wrote *Makers of Electricity* and *A Catalogue of the Wheeler Gift*, the latter an epoch-making contribution to science.

Brother Potamian has not been entirely fortunate in his biographer, who does not always meet the requirements of either objective scholarship or gracious diction. Impressed by Potamian's genius and piety, but unmindful of his extreme reserve, the author is at pains to tell something of the man's boyhood, the facts of which he does not possess. He thus misses the opportunity of giving an impression of the times that might have affected Potamian while he rationalizes details which make his book appear somewhat naïve. From a surmise he deduces an opinion which leads to a conviction invariably covered by "no doubt." As a result, the work is marred by defects commonly associated with the Whig interpretation of history. The past is interpreted in the light of present, and the *reductio ad absurdum* is never far off. When to these are added paradoxes, bulls, and a nineteenth-century manner of writing, one is apt to feel that the author is composing a period piece. Dr. Battersby's chief difficulty would seem to be an inability to determine which facet of his subject's career—religious or scientific—should be developed. In consequence he fails to do full justice to the lofty moral and intellectual stature of Brother Potamian or to assess adequately his influence for good on the Catholic and scientific mind.

THOMAS L. COONAN

Saint Louis University

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

Bishop Tamarón's Visitation of New Mexico, 1760. Edited by Eleanor B. Adams. [Publications in History, Volume XV.] (Albuquerque: Historical Society of New Mexico. 1954. Pp. 118. $2.25.)

This is a translation of only the New Mexican section of Bishop Tamarón y Romeral's report. Since his visitation included the entire Diocese of Durango which covered all of New Spain from Zacatecas northward, students of the Spanish frontier will want the entire document, even if New Mexico is their primary interest. It is, fortunately, available as Volume VII of the *Biblioteca histórica mexicana de obras inéditas*, from which, in fact, this translation was made.

Bishop Tamarón was a prelate of great ability; experienced in administration through thirty years of service in the Diocese of Caracas, often in important posts; and an author of published works, as well as of an

unfinished history of Caracas. His diocese doubtless benefitted from these admirable qualities; but his report would have been more revealing as an historical document if he had been somewhat less the polished and judicious diplomat, anxious, if possible, not to offend. His judgments are too balanced and moderate to throw much light on the perennial problems of Spanish frontier administration: the conflict of authority between the missionary fathers and the royal governors, or the problem of ecclesiastical jurisdiction that existed between the Franciscan missionary authorities and his own see. His only severe strictures are directed against the unfortunate failure of the friars to master the Indian tongues. The translation, though free, is faithful; although "Mexicans" might convey the sense of "gente de razón" better than does "Europeanized mixtures."

There are appendices on the visitation by Bishop Crespo in 1730. Two of the bishop's letters to the viceroy are given; these are more critical of the friars, and even suggest secularization of the Spanish town parishes. The vigorous reply of the Franciscan custos, Fray Andrés Varro, concludes the book. All of the texts are well annotated. There is a thirty-three page introduction.

EDWIN A. BEILHARZ

University of Santa Clara

The History of the Diocese of Boise: 1863-1953. By Cyprian Bradley, O.S.B., and Edward J. Kelly. (Boise: Diocese of Boise. 1953. Pp. xii, 481.)

Co-extensive in area with the State of Idaho, the Diocese of Boise is a suffragan see of the Archdiocese of Portland in Oregon. At the time of its erection in 1846 Oregon City was the metropolitan see of a province embracing the entire Oregon Country approximating an area of 650,000 square miles. This fact explains the amount of space devoted in this volume to the general history of the Church in the Northwest. Civil and religious jurisdictions, the fur trade, path-finding explorers and settlers, and the Idaho Indian who furnished the nucleus of the Church in Idaho—all these topics are given adequate treatment and furnish an informative and interesting background for the understanding of the evolution of the diocese. At the present time (1954) there are in the diocese eighty-two priests, fifty-one parishes, sixty-two missions, sixty stations, fifteen elementary parochial schools, five Catholic high schools, and eight hospitals. The massacre of Dr. Marcus Whitman, his wife, and twelve white men on November 29, 1847, by Cayuse Indians at Wailatpu near Fort Walla is discussed thoroughly because until recent years the calumniatory legend

was propagated that Catholic authorities were responsible for the atrocity. The Indian policy of President Grant ignored the rightful claim of the Catholic Church to the majority of the Indian missions and awarded the Catholic hierarchy eight instead of the forty missions, which Pierre-Jean De Smet, S.J., argued should be Catholic because of prior possession and development. Of the 3,782 Indians in Idaho today about one-fifth are Catholic. Father De Smet said the first Mass in Idaho on July 23, 1840, near the head of Henry's Lake. The first church, a log cabin, was erected by Father Nicholas Point, S.J., at St. Joe River near St. Maries, Idaho, early in December, 1842. In 1863 Fathers Toussaint Mesplie and André Poulin began missionary work in Idaho among the white Catholics. On March 3, 1868, Idaho under Bishop Louis A. Lootens was erected into a vicariate apostolic. Lootens resigned in 1876 and was succeeded by the following bishops: Alphonse J. Glorieux, second Vicar Apostolic of Idaho, 1885-1893, and first Bishop of Boise, 1893-1917, Daniel M. Gorman, 1918-1927, and the present ordinary, Edward Joseph Kelly, Bishop of Boise since 1928. From 1876 to 1885 Idaho was placed under the administration of the Archbishop of Oregon City, Francis Norbert Blanchet having announced his own appointment as administrator in a letter to the clergy dated August 22, 1876.

Abbot Bradley and Bishop Kelly furnish in this work complete biographies for the following missionaries: Toussaint Mesplie, 1863-1882; André Z. Poulin, 1863-1877; Alex J. A. Aarchambault, 1869-1880; Joseph M. Cataldo, S.J., 1866-1928; Louis Verhaag, 1880-1883; Emmanuel M. Nattini, 1880-1887, and Francis Hartlieb, 1883-1898. The story of the apostolic labors of these devoted men makes interesting and inspiring reading. The burdensome task of recruiting priests, educating the laity, and developing a practical fiscal policy to sustain Catholic life fell upon the shoulders of the bishops, and the bad economic conditions of the state interacted upon the maintenance of the Church, difficult in any circumstances in a missionary territory. The Society for the Propagation of the Faith made several allotments to the Church in Idaho, and the Church Extension Society contributed between 1905 and 1952 a total of $392,892.49 to the Diocese of Boise. After reading the biographies of the Idaho bishops the conviction is borne in upon the reader that these valiant shepherds and their auxiliaries, the priests of the Diocese of Boise, have left nothing undone to add to the growth, prestige, and glory of the American Church.

THOMAS F. CLEARY

Saint John's Rectory
Bradford, Illinois

The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931. By Norman F. Furniss. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1954. Pp. viii, 199. $3.75.)

Professor Furniss, in this able and carefully documented monograph, has written an account of one episode in the history of the basic Protestant tenets of the Bible as the sole rule of faith and the right of every man to interpret that work as he sees fit. This episode is the struggle which took place in various Protestant denominations after World War I over the question of "modernism" in general and of the question of evolution in particular. The author describes the beliefs of the members of these denominations called Fundamentalists. They are substantially those outlined in 1910 in the work entitled *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth.* He then passes on to a discussion of the characteristics of these men and women, their organizations, and their methods. Analyses of the controversies that sprang up in both branches of the Baptists and Presbyterians, among the Methodists, the Disciples of Christ, and, to a much lesser degree, the Episcopalians, follow. He points out in closing his account that the controversies started to simmer down after the death of William J. Bryan who had championed the cause of fundamentalism at the trial of John Scopes for teaching the evolutionary hypothesis to the students of Central High School in Dayton, Tennessee, contrary to the law of that state. The possibility of the legalization of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for purposes that were not medicinal and the depression absorbed their energies. The death of Bryan left them shepherdless and the more immediate evils of alcohol, poverty, and destitution distracted them from the origin of man.

The author, professedly, has not attempted to place this theological controversy in historical perspective either immediate or remote. He has written a specialized study that will enable the scholar to do that for himself. However, some of his observations do point to the possibility of connections with other manifestations of American life in the 1920's. Besides religious fundamentalism there was also an outbreak of nationalistic fundamentalism with religious overtones, notably the Klu Klux Klan. There was the experiment with prohibition sponsored chiefly by the more evangelical denominations. There may be some connection between the various displays of "the modern temper" described at the end of the decade by Joseph Wood Krutch, and exemplified by the activities of members of the "lost generation," and this attempted defense of a truncated version of Christianity by men who, for the most part, were not prepared intellectually or temperamentally to do so.

VINCENT C. HOPKINS

Fordham University

AMERICAN HISTORY

The Genius of American Politics. By Daniel J. Boorstin. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1953. Pp. ix, 202. $3.25.)

The Voice of America employees will not be particularly grateful to Daniel J. Boorstin for this book. In effect Dr. Boorstin is proclaiming that we Americans lack definite political theories and, therefore, we should presumably have little to export *via* such media as the Voice of America. In order to understand the author's point of view you must add to your vocabulary a coined word, "givenness," and you must also ascribe a particular meaning to another, "preformation." By "preformation" Dr. Boorstin means "the notion that in the beginning and once for all, the Founding Fathers of the nation gave us a political theory, a scheme of values, and a philosophy of government. As we have seen, it is an ideal, a static kind of 'givenness'—a gift of orthodoxy, the gift of the past" (p. 22).

The author points to Lincoln's Gettysburg Address of 1863, with its reference to "a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," as an illustration of this American belief that American political theories sprang forth full grown early in the seventeenth century, and have experienced no significant additions since that time. Likewise, he recalls to us that most Americans consider themselves followers either of Hamilton or of Jefferson. Presumably no one has made any substantial addition to the political thought presented by each of those political leaders. He doubts if any other country, except possibly Soviet Russia, has such unswerving faith in its "national saints" as that possessed by the United States. We would consider it sacrilegious, he implies, if anyone were to maintain seriously that he could add to the political theories formulated by our Founding Fathers.

Because of this faith in the ideas formulated in the period 1775-1800, Dr. Boorstin believes that our history since 1775 has possessed unity and coherence, and this in spite of the Civil War. During the period since 1775, Europe has been visited by one revolutionary movement after another, but we have remained comparatively calm, and have meanwhile benefited from our climate, our soil, and our mineral resources. Much stress is placed upon New England because the author evidently believes that no other area of settlement made much of an impression upon the nation to be known as the United States. Not everyone will agree with this belief. However, Dr. Boorstin explains in detail why he believes that Puritanism was well adapted for life in the New England wilderness of 1620. These New England settlers brought a philosophy with them which the author maintains was precisely the type which would "fortify

a weak community on a wild continent." He further observes: "A disillusioned, indolent, or cowardly Puritan was a contradiction in terms" (p. 40). Incidentally, it is admitted that the Puritans manifested little interest in converting the Indians, whom the Puritans believed were the agents of Satan. With the increasing security of life in New England, the rigorous philosophy of the Puritans tended to disappear, after having presumably served its purpose. Perhaps not nearly enough emphasis is placed by the author on the fact that many of the liberties that we take for granted would have been denied by the Puritans. He makes their political theories seem more attractive than they were. Not much that is novel is presented by Dr. Boorstin, but most readers will find the chapters interesting and helpful in understanding our national history.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University
Chicago

This New World (The Civilization of Latin America). By William Lytle Schurz. (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc. 1954. Pp. xii, 436. $6.00.)

One comes from the reading of this book with the sense that his author feels very much at home with Bernal Diaz del Castillo and the *True History of the Conquest of New Spain*. Both of them were on the spot, and told what they saw, and told it so well that the story is magnetic. Not a history, *This New World* offers a series of studies on the great questions students ask about Latin America. In order it covers the environment, the Indian, the Spaniard, the conqueror, the Negro, the foreigner, the Church, the woman, the city, and the Brazilian. Wide familiarity with the lands and the historical materials is evident on every page. The chapters on the Spaniard and the conqueror belong in any list of fine works on history. In detailing data on the Negro, a serious omission occurs, for James A. King is today, perhaps, our best authority on African slaves in Latin America. What is written of the foreigner relies too much on Hakluyt, though even there most teachers will be grateful for the reminder to search those early narratives. In speaking of the city, Schurz strikes one brilliant intuition, for surely our southern neighbors belong much more to their cities than to their republics.

It is only fair to praise the broad tolerance and understanding of the author in his writing about the Church. He gives it proper space, and a friendliness of treatment far above the ordinary. It is true that for an outsider to write its story well is just about impossible. There is the old problem of seeing it only through the windows, and thus missing

nine-tenths of its actual life. Thus the notice that "the Spaniards were little given to theology as it was unrelated to the practical problems of men" would indicate too little acqauintance with the notables listed in the paragraph cited (p. 241): Suarez, Molina, and Vitoria. One would do well to look upward in the presence of such university figures. Then, too, there is in this treatment a lack of touch with the many grand, even heroic, episodes in that story. Guadalupe, the vast mission enterprises from Luis de Valdivia in Chile to Junípero Serra in California, the remarkable verse of Juana de la Cruz, the tremendous work of Zumárraga as Icazbalceta describes it, the making of so many states and provinces at their hands, seem set in shadow against the few but high-lighted cases of infidelity to calling and greed in the wild period of the conquest. Something similar might be added about the chapter on the woman. Here the reader is disappointed, unless his taste is for the abnormal. All the data is factual, but it is far from the real place of woman in life, there and now. Nevertheless, this book will be most useful for teachers no less than students. It has an underlying human sympathy and kindness in all its wide expanse, and it probes a depth of documentation that would delight any fellow historian.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Xavier University
Cincinnati

George Washington. A Biography. By Douglas Southall Freeman. Volumes I-II, *Young Washington* (1948. Pp. xxvi, 549; vii, 464); Volume III, *Planter and Patriot* (1951. Pp. xxxviii, 600); Volume IV, *Leader of the Revolution* (1951. Pp. viii, 736); Volume V, *Victory, with the Help of France* (1952. Pp. xvi, 570). (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons).

George Washington has been the subject of many biographies, the hero of many tales (ranging from the true, through the probable and the dubious, to the apocryphal), and the protagonist of multitudinous short stories, novels, and histories. Never, in all this welter of writing about Washington has there appeared a truly satisfactory, completely accurate, thoroughly scientific, and readable study of the whole men. It is, perhaps, too much to expect one author to understand, appreciate, and adequately interrelate in a single descriptive work the many facets of a life that was intertwined with the birth of a nation. Washington Irving came close to doing this, but he had not at his disposal the sources which have been collected and made available to students since his day. Having just completed his eight volumes on Washington, Irving died. Worthington

Ford, in the early 1900's, set out to collect the writings of Washington. This he did with admirable accuracy and amplitude, finishing his task just before he died. Later still, at the order of the Congress, John C. Fitzpatrick edited the magnificent and definitive Bicentennial Edition of Washington's *Writings*. As the last volume went to press, Fitzpatrick died. Douglas Southall Freeman was correcting proof on the next-to-last volume of this most recent Washington biography when he died. That volume will appear in the fall of 1954. It will conclude with the end of Washington's first administration. Unfortunately, there seems to be little prospect at this time for eventual publication of the final volume projected by Dr. Freeman covering the remaining five years of the first president's life. Freeman's techniques in the collection and handling of source materials, as well as his personal skill as a narrator, were unique and highly individualistic. He is reported to have left a mass of data and notes for a seventh volume, but it would be very difficult for any other author to achieve, even with their help, the kind of over-all unity of interpretation that characterized Freeman's work.

This means, in brief, that American historical scholarship has suffered a severe loss. Freeman's interpretations may at points be queried. He may at times be criticized for over-emphasizing what seem to be extraneous details of the geneological or social environment in which Washington lived. Yet the over-all result of his work is a rich, full-bodied tapestry of the life of a great man and the birth of a great nation. With the sixth and last volume yet to come—with the projected final volume lost forever, this is still a great biography.

From it emerges, in Freeman's words, a Washington who was ". . . a human being and not a monument in frozen flesh." Volumes I and II cover the first twenty-seven years of Washington's life. They do not add a great deal of factual material on Washington himself to what was already known. Because of the manner in which Freeman integrated his character into the life of his times, however, they provide a three-dimensional study of the great Virginian in the formative years of his life. The facts of Washington's experiences are interesting, to be sure, but in themselves they provide no satisfactory answer to those who seek in these years clues to the true nobility of character which marked the life of the mature Washington. Freeman, by bringing the events of the times and the social milieu of colonial Virginia to life, has placed Washington in his proper setting. This type of presentation makes of him a person whose faults and virtues can be seen and understood for what they were—a product of the hereditary and environmental influences which interacted upon him. In the process of revivifying the Virginia in which young Washington grew up, Freeman has created a remarkably well-rounded picture of local colonial life. As one reads on in these vol-

umes it becomes increasingly clear that this fulsome type of treatment, which seems wordy in spots, is essential to the true understanding of Washington's character. His concepts of fair play and of justice, his standards of morality and of conduct, his ambitions, his fears, and his desires emerge clearly delineated and explained by reference to his associates and his times.

Planter and Patriot, the third volume of the series, follows the course of Washington's life from 1758 to 1775. At the beginning he returns to the life of a Virginia planter, having just resigned his military commission as commander of the Virginia colony's troops. New Year's Eve, 1775, finds him at Cambridge, Massachusetts, in command of the continental troops besieging British-held Boston. During these seventeen years Washington lived quietly, conserving and developing his plantations, performing the public and private services expected in colonial Virginia from a man of his station in life. He served in the Virginia House of Burgesses, demonstrating neither political brilliance nor political imbecility. As the quarrel between Britain and her American colonies sharpened, Washington matter-of-factly made up his mind where he stood. And from this stand he never deviated. Separation from Great Britain he thought was neither desirable nor necessary, but if the English colonists were denied their political rights, he believed they should take up arms to defend them.

Washington went to Philadelphia in September, 1774, as an inconspicuous member of the Virginia delegation to the First Continental Congress. If he spoke there at all, his words were not recorded. He served on no committees. The spring of 1775 found him back in Philadelphia again for the Second Congress. Hostilities had begun, but still the representatives of the colonies hoped for reconciliation. It became obvious in short order that the New England troops before Boston needed a commander who could unite them and keep them in the field. The delegates to the Congress searched for them an and found Washington among their own number.

Perhaps the most valuable and engrossing portion of this volume is Freeman's study of what has been one of the most tantalizing unanswered queries of American history: how is it that in 1775 George Washington was a relatively unknown Virginia planter possessing a moderate but undistinguished amount of military experience, while a year later the same man had become the hope and symbol of the struggle for American independence? His intervening accomplishments in no way explain this development. He was the appointee of the Continental Congress, and its members were, of course, anxious to justify the wisdom of their choice by lauding Washington to a degree which his actual achievements did not warrant at this early date. What confounds all historians (and it has confounded Freeman too) is that Washington lived up to the reputation

given him and surpassed it in every respect. Before its end he *was* the American Revolution. Where did he get the wisdom in battle, the forcefulness in dealing with the disparate colonies and with their representatives in Congress, the compassion and understanding which won the affection of the men under him, the subtlety and tact which made him a model of correct military conduct even in the eyes of professional European soldiers of high rank, powerful connections, and vast experience? Freeman does not answer this question categorically. In effect he frankly states that it cannot be answered categorically. But he weighs the elements of Washington's life and training against the problems with which the general of the continental forces had to deal. In the final analysis, Freeman probably comes as close to an explanation of the enigma as one can. Personal character—honesty, rectitude, charity—these were Washington's in full measure. In addition he had what Freeman calls the two "supreme qualities" needed by the man who was to head the feeble Continental Army. He had "patience and determination, inexhaustible and inextinguishable," and he was "a patriot who did not equivocate," possessing the ability to give determined leadership with no thought of self.

A little less than two and a half years of Washington's life (1776-1778) are the subject of the longest volume yet published in this series. This is the volume called *Leader of the Revolution*. In spite of its length, it is a model of excision and dissection. Washington and the Revolution are well-nigh inseparable. To write of the man without writing a complete history of the conflict has always presented to Washington biographers the greatest problem they have had to face. Probably none has succeeded as well as Freeman. He has kept his eye continually on his subject. The focal point of the narrative is always Washington. Events taking place elsewhere are detailed only insofar as they affect the course of Washington's affairs or influence his decisions. The result is, as might be expected, practically a history of the Revolution, though not one which an historian of the conflict (as distinguished from a biographer of Washington) would consider well balanced. Freeman has clarified and proven beyond cavil one point which historians have been slow to accept definitively: that Washington's greatest contribution during these early and most critical years of the Revolution was administrative rather than strategic. By the use of persuasion, of threats, of cajolery, and of any other type of pressure which he could bring to bear, Washington kept an ever-vanishing army in the field. He wheedled money, arms, and uniforms from an impecunious and parsimonious Congress; he persuaded lukewarm "rebels" to stay in the ranks and leave their fields untilled; he shamed colonial legislatures into recurrent troop levies and, in many ways, worked and struggled to keep the power of the united colonies alive. For all the power they did have was the Continental Army. Without it the cause of American inde-

pendence would have been irretrievably lost. This Washington knew. To keep it alive became the driving motive of his career in these years.

Nothing deterred Washington from this purpose, not even the loathesome insinuations of the Conway Cabal which sought to remove him from his post of command. Freeman has brought together in one place all the known documentary facts in this obscure plot to foist a titled foreign general on the American army. Some aspects of the plot are still not altogether clear, but there emerges from Freeman's narrative a more accurate appraisal of its purposes, its means, and its participants than this reviewer has seen elsewhere.

Spring, 1778, and news of the French alliance with the United States, came to Valley Forge together. Washington's joy was deep and sincere. Whatever else might happen, he saw in this event the promise of ultimate victory. He was not deceived. The vicissitudes of military alliance between dissimilar and sometimes incompatible nations marked the course of America's earliest foreign connection. Co-operation is a word, but giving it substance in action is often difficult. The French minister wrangled with Congress. French military and naval commanders wrangled with their American opposite numbers. Yet victory came. When it did, at Yorktown, it was stamped with the unmistakable hallmark of destiny. No military campaign of modern times has been characterized by a more precise deployment of military and naval strength, nor by more accurate timing on the part of all the elements involved. De Grasse, sailing northward from the Antilles, Washington and Rochambeau pushing overland by forced marches from the north, Lafayette pressing up from the south, joined forces at that precise moment when Cornwallis had led his troops out onto the Yorktown peninsula to be ferried back to New York by Clinton's fleet. As the French-American forces closed the land approaches to the peninsula, the bellying sails of De Grasse's vessels blotted from the view of Cornwallis the masts of the British fleet just rising over the horizon. Radio communication could have effected no more precise a juncture of forces.

Here was triumph and peace in all but name. Two years passed before Britain formally signed the treaty of peace with her erstwhile colonies. But military operations were desultory and small-scale. After Yorktown, Britain sought only to end the struggle on the best terms she could obtain. The very day (December 4, 1783) that the last British troopships lifted anchor to sail out of New York harbor, George Washington, in sight of that same harbor, laid aside his command, bade his officers farewell, and set out on the journey southward to resume his life as a gentleman planter of Virginia. Here Freeman's fifth volume, *Victory, with the Help of France,* leaves the general. The final chapter of this volume is a penetrating study of the qualities which made the "Man of the Revolution."

Quibbles about typographical errors, misplaced middle initials, and inverted commas are omitted. Indeed, this reviewer noted none or, perhaps, failed to recognize them. Indices and bibliographies are copious and adequate. Footnotes there are in quantities to delight the scholar. Unlike many footnotes, these are frequently a joy to read because of the sidelights, humorous, human, or tragic, which they throw upon the main narrative. Particularly valuable are the 150 pages of appendices in which appear new documentary materials of a significant nature. Illustrations and maps are profuse, well chosen, and beautifully captioned or explained. Many photographs of centrally-important documents find place in these books. These are distinguished volumes in format, printing, and binding. They are a credit to their publisher and will be a lasting monument to the memory of their author.

JOHN J. MENG

Hunter College of the City of New York

The American Revolution, 1775-1783. By John Richard Alden. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1954. Pp. xviii, 294. $5.00.)

This is a volume of the New American Nation series, under the editorship of Henry Steele Commager and Richard B. Morris. In the preface the author states that half of the book is devoted to warfare, and he adds, "No apology is offered for emphasizing things military." This reviewer agrees, but he is puzzled by the almost complete omission of things naval and maritime. Commodore D. W. Knox's outstanding work, *The Naval Genius of George Washington* (Boston, 1932), is listed in the bibliography under biographical studies. The excellent book by Admiral Sir William James, *British Navy in Adversity* (New York, 1926), is correctly listed under military studies, but neither work appears to have made any impression on the author of this volume, which is regrettable.

The author records that Lord Barrington, Secretary at War, urged a naval blockade of the colonies (p. 20), but he passes over this statement without explaining how the whole story might have been different if King George III or his influential advisers had possessed the judgment to enable them to appreciate this advice. It may be argued that if they had really understood the military and naval situation involved they would have appreciated also the political issues and not have provoked the colonists to rebellion. Yet this line of reasoning is not adopted by the author.

This book is well written and presents a rounded, well balanced treatment of the war and its causes, except for its blind spots on sea-going

matters. A reviewer is naturally impelled, however, to compare this work with the earlier American Nation series, published by Scribners fifty years ago. Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard edited the earlier series, and the topics were divided somewhat differently. Volume VIII, *Preliminaries of the Revolution,* by George Elliott Howard, covered the period 1763 to 1775, and Volume IX, *The American Revolution,* by Claude Halstead Van Tyne, dealt with the years 1776-1783. After reading all three volumes this reviewer sees no improvement in the new work. The new one is very good, and the style is different, but the older volumes were very good also, although Van Tyne, perhaps, was inclined to give too much credit to our European allies.

JOHN B. HEFFERNAN

Washington, D. C.

Traitorous Hero. The Life and Fortunes of Benedict Arnold. By Willard M. Wallace. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1954. Pp. xiii, 394. $5.00.)

A great deal of interest has been paid in recent years to our militia diplomats of the Revolution. While studies have repeatedly been made of our equally amateur military leaders of this period, this new monograph on Benedict Arnold is a welcome addition, for here is a study which fortunately combines a delightful blend of pleasing literary style and scholarly research. Beginning with Arnold's early years, the author simply but effectively describes his wonderful mother, Hannah King Arnold, and the unfortunate, alcholic father, Arnold Sr. As the years pass one reads of the mother's influence in a typical Connecticut setting during the last decade and a half before the outbreak of war with England. As one might suspect, young Arnold, engrossed as he was in the trade and commerce of the period, learned to resent the mounting regulation of colonial trade by the mother country. Soon he became a leader in the radical group of the neighborhood. Like his New England contemporaries, he had a lifelong prejudice against all Catholics, and against Frenchmen in particular.

With his expanding business Arnold moved his little ships from Canada to the West Indies. Overland journeys carried him over the very routes he was to fight for during the early years of the Revolution. By 1775, only thirty-four years old, Arnold had come far. He was in easy circumstances and enjoyed a fair prospect of improving them. He was a merchant and apothecary and successful in both. Respected by many of the older families of New Haven, he, nonetheless, had a firm grasp on the leadership of the radical elements of the area.

Arnold's great career as a soldier really began after the news of Lexington and Concord. Over the protests of the town selectmen he mustered a little group of fifty men and marched for Boston. Eager, vain, ambitious, impetuous, he sought to rise in the service. These traits had already provoked the enmity of business contacts; they were to be basic reasons for the animosity he encountered during his honorable military service in the Continental Army. The clash with Allen over the command of Ticonderoga was but the first of a long series of incidents which finally culminated in his court martial of 1780. Despite personality clashes and intercolonial jealousies, Arnold was given the command of the futile Canadian campaign. Only his indomitable will carried the men through the appalling hardship of the overland trail and the subsequent fighting in the dead of winter. Equally brilliant were his withdrawal from Canada and the brief naval career on Lake Champlain during the summer and fall of 1776. In the face of these disasters for the colonial cause, Arnold's enemies renewed their vigorous attacks and even demanded his arrest. In the midst of this uproar, his name was passed on the promotion list. Seemingly fruitless appeals to Congress so tortured him that he even submitted his resignation on July 11, 1777. But Washington's request that he resume a command in the north induced him to remain in the service. Gallant service at Fort Stanwix and during the Saratoga campaign followed. In the waning months of 1777, and during the winter of 1778, Arnold rode the crest of a wave of popularity which satisfied even his thirst for acclaim.

The balance of the book is a study of the steps which led to treason. Beset by his enemies, he fought back. Nor was he entirely guiltless of some of the charges. He became embittered. Married now to young Peggy Shippen, who later shared in the conspiracy, his ample life in Philadelphia increased the financial strain on his resources. Vainglorious and seemingly frustrated by his enemies at home, he turned for the first time to the British during May, 1779. Long months of negotiation followed. With his appointment to the coveted post at West Point, the conspiracy hastened to its disastrous end on September 23, 1780. Quite rightly the author finds numerous reasons for Arnold's efforts to betray his country. Self-righteous, he hoped to fashion a new career with the British which would involve wealth, position, and honor from an unimpeded military career. By way of summary the author describes Arnold as easily "the outstanding battlefield officer of the Revolution." He was a brilliant and daring soldier who accomplished a great deal for the young republic. But he was "proud, avaricious, imperious, a man who saw in every slight a blemish upon his honor." He was infallible in his own eyes and his consciousness of his own rectitude seems to have evoked no inner

revulsion. He was his own standard. "If no American traitor has ever rendered such valuable service to his country, no treason has ever matched his in perfidy."

HOWARD J. KERNER

John Carroll University

Benjamin Franklin and American Foreign Policy. By Gerald Stourzh. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1954. Pp. xvii, 335. $4.50.)

This is a trenchant and provocative analysis of Franklin's philosophy of international relations within the broad framework of developing American politics, domestic and foreign. The author probes concepts basic to the formulation of Franklin's approach to foreign affairs: his understanding of human nature, the idea of progress, the place of reason and emotion, the nature of politics and democracy. And the conclusion is drawn that Franklin had qualified his position in almost every instance and that he was not the complete personification of the Enlightenment. There is a perceptive investigation of the motives and manner of Franklin's shift from conservatism (monocratic) to radicalism (democratic) as the course of events led to the colonial decision for independence. The confusion, sometimes bordering on vagary, of Franklin's notion of national interest, e.g., is explained as due to his ways and modes of expression, the conditioning influence of his colonialism and Whiggism (and, implicitly, to basic conflicts in his philosophy). The conclusion that Franklin's fundamental principle for the predication of action in international politics was "the common denominator of personal needs" to be measured by mutuality and equity, of enlightened self-interest, and the avoidance of extreme alternates, is proposed in reasoned argument. The author also investigate and interprets Franklin's words and actions in relation to such broad phenomena as mercantilism, the "new" diplomacy, the concept of security, the belief in Manifest Destiny, and such particularized instances as his pro-French attitude.

All this is not to say that this study, authoritative as it is, has produced with finality *the* interpretation of Franklin's motives and activity. Indeed, every chapter breeds the prospects of intriguing discussion, e.g., one might debate whether or not there was more of a distinction than the author allows between the Christian fathers' notion of government and that of Tom Paine; and one might take exception to the pronouncement that the Christian concept of human nature included the idea of human depravity (a Manichean and Calvinist notion, but not Catholic). And to many Christians there are no "nonprudential" teachings of Christianity.

Prudence is the guide in all Christian asceticism and morality. Also one might dispute the interpretation of Wilson's Mobile address (in which the plain qualification of *material* interest is slighted, in the tradition of "neo-realists"), and the statement that the battle of Saratoga (October, 1777) brought about the decision for French open aid (rather than offering the occasion to implement a decision of the previous July). There is also the lurking suspicion in a reader's mind that overmuch is made of Franklin's use of moral tones in order to indicate that he was more of a "neo-realist" than a moderate realist-idealist of the later Wilsonian stamp.

Notes, bibliographical and informational, and an index add to the value of this interpretative account.

MARTIN F. HASTING

Saint Louis University

Americans Interpret Their Civil War. By Thomas J. Pressly. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1954. Pp. xvi, 347. $5.00.)

Several years ago Mr. Pressly submitted his dissertation, entitled *Clio's Changing Mind: Attitudes toward the Causes of the American Civil War* (1950), as proof of his scholarly abilities. With additions and revisions, that work now appears in print under a new title.

Mr. Pressly has attempted to analyze the views of American writers toward their civil war, trying to group them into categories and fit them into patterns—an effort which makes the work stilted and superficial and which necessitates a careful selection of quotations in line with the pre-conceived pattern. He breaks ground by treating the writers of the Civil War generation. Greeley, Seward, Henry Wilson, and John W. Draper are presented as contributors to the Unionist school. By ignoring most of what Stephen A. Douglas wrote and said, Mr. Pressly was able to squeeze the "Little Giant" into the same bed with Seward and Wilson. Confederate viewpoints were well presented from the writings of Jefferson Davis, Edward A. Pollard, and Alexander H. Stephens. Then Dr. Pressly turned his hand to the Copperhead interpretation, emphasizing those views which treated the war as "needless." He analyzed Copperheadism ineptly and maligned Vallandigham—even accusing the outspoken Ohioan of sanctioning the schemes of Confederate agents (in Canada) who hoped to stir up revolution in the Middle West. Furthermore, Horatio Seymour deserved prominence in any explanation of Copperhead views.

The author was on firmer ground when he analyzed the writings of James Ford Rhodes. Woodrow Wilson, Channing, McMaster, and Turner

received brief attention as "trained historians" and "second generation" interpreters. He then gave Charles A. Beard and the Marxists their day in court. He failed to emphasize that Beard was a pragmatist and a Fabian socialist, and he even indicated that Beard's economic interpretation of Civil War causation could be viewed as pro-southern.

Dr. Pressly saved his sharpest darts for the "revisionists," whom he accused of resurrecting and renovating Copperhead views of war causation. He failed to understand that the "revisionists" were sponsors of multiple causation, and he claimed that the Randall-Craven school was the product of "war-weariness and disillusionment following upon the First World War." The author sees the need to revise the "revisionists" in line with the neo-nationalism of our own day and in line with the current Harvardian slant. A treatment of Nevin's *Ordeal of the Union* was tacked on as an afterthought in a confusing chapter entitled "The Confusion of Voices."

Some critics may protest that the works of Osterweis, Nye, Potter, and Simms have been by-passed. Others may contend that the philosophical setting for each generation was shallow; still others may protest that the literary style is heavy and that it dulls the reader's interest. But all should welcome this work for the discussion it will stimulate and the controversy it will generate. It is a contribution to Civil War historiography.

FRANK L. KLEMENT

Marquette University

G. P. A. Healy, American Artist. By Marie de Mare. (New York: David McKay Co., Inc. 1954. Pp. xvi, 304. $6.00.)

This biography is by the artist's granddaughter, Marie de Mare. It has a sub-title, "An Intimate Chronicle of the Nineteenth Century," is dedicated "To the Memory of George P. A. Healy and Louisa Healy and to Their Descendants," and carries an introduction by Eleanor Roosevelt. The relationship of the author to the subject, the sub-title, dedication, and the prestige of the name of the person who wrote the introduction constitute in themselves a casual review of the book. Any artist might wish for such a biography, done with admiration, sympathy, and with practically no critical comment. It is a fascinating and intimate view of an American artist of the nineteenth century who enjoyed an admirable and happy family life and a very successful career. It may well serve, too, as a brief history of American art from Gilbert Stuart to John Singer Sargent. Healy told in his *Reminiscences of a Portrait Painter* (Chicago, 1894), a book on which his granddaughter naturally drew for material,

that he, "Little Healy," saw Gilbert Stuart on the streets of Boston. Moreover, his father's portrait had been painted by Stuart, and the first painting which Healy copied for King Louis Philippe of France was Stuart's "Washington." Healy was encouraged in his youth by Miss Jane Stuart, and it was Thomas Sully who advised him to make painting his profession. It was Healy who, in turn, in later years advised John Singer Sargent to make art his career. It may be fitting at this point to indicate that there is a very proper revival of interest in Healy, stirred up, for the most part, by the exhibition "Healy's Sitters" held in 1950 at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts under the able direction of Leslie Cheek, Jr.

The present study is devoted principally to the years 1832-1892, Healy's productive period. It is the story of the little Boston boy, born in 1813, who at twenty-seven became court painter for King Louis Philippe and found a friend and, one might say, servant in Edmé Savinien Dubourjal, the miniaturist, who gave up his career to follow the American artist. Healy met Thomas Couture in 1834, in the studio of the great and unfortunate painter, Baron Gros. Couture became his staunch and faithful friend. Healy was always fortunate in his relations with people, be they humble, wearers of crowns and coronets or silk hats, or no hats at all. Mrs. Harrison Gray Otis sat for him when he was a mere youth; General Lewis Cass introduced him to Louis Philippe, and all his distinguished sitters seemed to take him to their hearts, including Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Pius IX, Louis Thiers, Charles Goodyear, Franz Liszt, Charles I of Roumania, Lord Bulwer-Lytton, François Guizot, John Cardinal McCloskey, Henry W. Longfellow, and Audubon, to mention only a few. The artist died in Chicago in 1894, and he is the only painter of whom I have knowledge who passed into eternal life with the words "Happy, so happy" on his lips.

His granddaughter ends her book on this note: "In the Cathedral to which flocked the people of Chicago, Father Agnew began with deep feeling: 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant. . . .' And all who were there felt the everlasting truth of these words. Throughout his life George Healy had served his God, his country, his family, his friends. He served the art he loved."

Briefly this work, as the reader may have gathered, is the loving tribute that a granddaughter of her background would write of a distinguished forebear whose lot had been a particularly eventful and happy one.

JOHN O'CONNOR, JR.

Carnegie Institute of Fine Arts

Hidden Threads of History. Wilson through Roosevelt. By Louis B. Wehle. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1953. Pp. xix, 300. $4.00.)

Not a few of the self-styled "liberals" of the pre-New Deal days found themselves, soon after the advent of the messiah, unable to negotiate his sharp turns to the "left." Some, in the Moley manner, deserted the caravan entirely; others occasionally took leave for a time only to return to try again to persuade the leader that there was a less perilous, although a slower, approach to the "promised land." In the latter group was Louis B. Wehle, New York lawyer and government aide during the Wilson and Roosevelt administrations, and author of this personal narrative.

A friend of Franklin D. Roosevelt since their college days and an occasional political adviser, Wehle was, according to his account, one of the original and consistent Roosevelt supporters, but quite a few items of the New Deal domestic program met with his strong disapproval. In this book Wehle is particularly critical of the use of seemingly unethical means of depriving owners of their hydro-electric properties in the Tennessee River basin without fair compensation, and of the assault by F.D.R. on the fundamental constitutional safeguard of judicial supremacy. He also takes issue with the public and private debt repudiation through the devaluation of the dollar and the nullification of the gold clause in government and private bonds, and with the acceptance by the Democratic Party organization of large financial contributions from the C.I.O. while the administration was countenancing the illegal sit-down strikes and other union "excesses."

On the other hand, Roosevelt's stand against government ownership of the railroads is favorably noted as evidence of his belief in the American system of free enterprise, while the destroyers deal with England and the lend-lease procedure are termed "surely great" statesmanship by the obviously internationalist Wehle. All in all it is the author's belief that "Roosevelt's mistakes in both domestic and international affairs are inseparable from the inherent defects of our governmental system, which concentrates an overwhelming burden on one man, especially in time of war."

While the first and last parts of this book deal with various problems of war-time industrial mobilization, with the hope expressed by the author that his experiences during the two great wars as here recounted would help to avoid errors in any future period of mobilization, the largest portion of the book deals with Wehle's account of the political career of F.D.R., and herein lies its chief interest. In orthodox Democratic fashion the intervening years of Republican rule between Wilson and Roosevelt are termed "a decade of stodginess," with Hoover's apparently morbid fear of adverse criticism being noted as a major national misfortune.

The reference to this trait of the former Republican president is found in one of the many thumbnail character and/or personality sketches that

ST. MARY OF THE SPRINGS
COLLEGE LIBRARY

appear throughout the book. Wehle is definitely at his best in these brief, incisive sketches of many of the national figures with whom he was associated during the Wilson and Roosevelt administrations.

ROBERT J. CORNELL

Saint Norbert College

Ideals and Self-Interest in America's Foreign Relations: The Great Transformation of the Twentieth Century. By Robert Osgood. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1953. Pp. x, 491. $6.50.)

Unless the reviewer is in error, here is a new approach to the writing of American diplomatic history. Instead of resting content with a mere narration of events as has hitherto been pretty much the custom among diplomatic historians, the author employs a technique which resembles more that of an historian of ideas. The result is a first-rate piece of writing which is intelligent, mature, and thought provoking. It is the kind of a book which should appeal to the student but which the general reader will find too verbose and abstruse.

Osgood examines the question of whether ideals and self-interest on the national level are mutually exclusive. His answer is that they are not. Human ideals can be the guide to a healthy and practical American foreign policy as long as the citizens know the political facts. The people possess a strong element of pragmatic common sense which needs only to be informed to be effective. As the title indicates, the central theme of this study is to explore the problem of reconciling national self-interest with universal ideals which transcend the interests of the nation. To discover the basic significance of ideals and self-interest in American foreign relations, it is necessary to consider in some detail the nation's experience in world politics. Hence this book is "an historical interpretation of the evolution of the American attitude toward world politics since the turn of the century." Not only the sources but also the principles of American foreign relations are explored within the special frame of reference of the relation between universal ideals and national self-interest. The latter is defined as "a state of affairs valued solely for its benefits to the nation," whereas the former is "a standard of conduct or a state of affairs worthy of achievement by virtue of its universal moral value."

National self-interest involves such concepts as survival or self-preservation, "vital interests," self-sufficiency, national prestige, and national aggrandizement or the increase of national power, wealth, or prestige. The ideals considered are those derived from the Christian-liberal-humanitarian tradition of western civilization. These include the belief that

"the ultimate moral value is the innate dignity and worth of every human being," the need for the creation of a brotherhood of man, "a progressive command over nature to the end that every individual may share the material benefits essential to a full and happy existence on earth," the principles of right conduct which apply to personal relations and which operate by force of conscience, custom, or law and, finally, allegiance to a universal goal such as "peace, good will, and justice among nations, or freedom and a decent standard of living for all men."

Individuals, thinking and acting as members of the nation, whose attitude toward other nations is governed by self-interest are defined as egoists, while those who are governed by ideals which transcend the national interest are idealists. Those who believe that nations are motivated by self-interest are realists (*sic*) while those who think that nations conduct themselves according to idealistic ends and motives which are above selfish interests are utopians. The clash between these two schools is examined during the period of two "crusades," the Spanish-American War and World War I and their aftermaths, and the World War II era in which the American people underwent "a major transformation in America's adjustment to her international environment" during which there was a "growth of political realism, the vital balance wheel needed to restrain and give direction to the nation's egoistic and idealistic impulses."

While there are a good index and a plethora of bibliographical notes, there is no bibliography, critical or otherwise. If one may make one other minor criticism of this splendid and arresting study, it is the author's reliance upon published materials supplemented only by consultation with "those who are thoroughly familiar with all the relevant historical material, including the many unpublished manuscripts and private papers." This method is justified by Dr. Osgood on the ground he has "reason to think that an exhaustive investigation of these sources would not significantly modify my central thesis."

THOMAS H. D. MAHONEY.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

The World Crisis and American Foreign Policy: The Undeclared War, 1940-1941. By William L. Langer and S. Everett Gleason. (New York: Published for the Council on Foreign Relations by Harper & Bros. 1953. Pp. xvi, 963. $10.00.)

This is a better book than the authors' *The Challenge to Isolation* (New York, 1952). With the same wealth of detail, and attention to worldwide

developments, with the same literary competence and range of documentation, it affords much more of the stuff out of which judgments can be fashioned. If it is not a definitive account, this is only because others will make contributions which will enable us to see more clearly particular responsibilities for the making of decisions, and there is here no final summing up of consequences. But for the study of United States wartime diplomacy in the year 1941 this work clears the record for examination as fairly as all but the most prejudiced could desire. Beyond that, and in a manner not likely to be superseded, the authors of *The Undeclared War* have established the setting so as to reveal the limitations of diplomacy as well as the degrees of foresight with which events were anticipated.

Three great actions, the formulation of the lend-lease program, the German assault on Russia, and the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor determine the story of the years which began with a majority of Americans still hoping to avoid involvement in a European war, and which ended with hostilities begun on a global scale. Significantly, there is no diplomatic prelude to war with Germany or Italy. It was a period in which President Roosevelt tried to provoke a war in the Atlantic—without success—and at the same time may have tried to postpone, but not really to avert, a war in the Pacific. As far back as November, 1940, there had been fears expressed by military planners, not that we should drift into a costly two-front conflict, but that a war with Japan would be most unsatisfactory if it *did not* bring on a declaration of war by Germany. That early, it was recommended "if war eventuated from a Japanese attack, the United States should initiate steps to bring Germany also into the war" (p. 750). When naval escort of lend-lease supplies was introduced in September, 1941, "It may well be," say the authors, that it "was intended in part to keep relations with Germany at least one step ahead of relations with Japan." But Hitler refused all provocations to declare war until Japan was engaged. Although the threat to friendly empires in the Pacific and southeast Asia was a real cause for concern, and although American obligations to uphold Chiang Kai Shek's government were then taken more seriously than at any time after Japan's defeat, nevertheless, a war with Japan was considered primarily a means to the end of getting our armed forces fully applied against Germany. Because the Japanese were so grievously underestimated, thought to be so weakened by measures of economic strangulation as to be not too serious a menace, only holding operations were envisaged for the Pacific theater, while the United States would enter the European war by the back door. On the other hand, opinion was offered in supposedly responsible quarters —in the Department of State—that there might be a Japanese surrender to inflexible American demands, and only after their ostentatious moves

to the south, toward Singapore, did it occur to strategists like Stimson that we should have to use military and naval force to stop them. In that event the Secretary of War was concerned about making sure that Japan was maneuvered into firing the first shot. There is no suggestion that the authors take seriously the charge that there was a deliberate exposure of the fleet at Pearl Harbor, but their careful revelations of official reactions in Washington during the last weeks before December 7 suggest strongly that war was considered imminent and, if it started in the neighborhood of the Philippines, far from undesirable.

If the Far East afforded the most interesting possibilities for getting us into the war, European and Mediterranean affairs indicated a likely British defeat unless American intervention occurred in time. The lend-lease act was no sooner on paper than German successes in the Balkans made it appear to be but a half-way measure. Then the apparently overwhelming attack on Russia in June seemed to point up the lack of power in balance against Germany. But this had been anticipated in Washington. The passage of the lend-lease bill was secured while the administration knew of the impending "climacteric," and this almost certainly was the motive behind its objections to any congressional specifications as to just where American aid should go. Particularly far-sighted in his recommendations was Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter ("a growing influence . . . in the sphere of foreign policy" about that time) who "advised against particularization of the powers to be granted the President and against specifications of the countries to receive Lend-Lease aid" (p. 256).

Thanks to an effective intelligence which made known the plans of Hitler, both Churchill and Roosevelt were able to plan to extend the greatest possible aid to Russia after June 22. But it became necessary to conciliate segments of American public opinion—the Catholics mainly—who were convinced of the wrongness of any co-operation with atheistic communism; and here came the President's opportunity to utilize his quasi-diplomatic connections with Pope Pius XII. Mr. Myron Taylor was instructed to secure, and he evidently did secure, an interpretation of *Divini Redemptoris* which made possible a distinction between aid to the Russian people [*sic*] and aid to Soviet communists. However, one "high Papal official" took it upon himself to warn the United States:

> If the war now in progress were to mean the end of both [Nazi and Communist] dangers, a period of tranquillity would be possible for Europe. If even one of these evils—Communism, for example—were to remain an active force, Europe would, within a few years, be in a situation identical with that in which it finds itself today. In fact, Communism, once victorious, would find no further resistance in Continental Europe and would spread among the Germanic peoples, the Slav races and finally among the Latins. In conse-

quence, within the space of a few years there would be an enormous Communistic bloc, whose inevitable destiny would be to provoke a war with England and America, regarded by the Communists as a capitalistic bloc (pp. 796-797).

But President Roosevelt was under the "delusion," properly so called by Professors Langer and Gleason, that the maintenance of the Russian cause "will mean the liberation of Europe from Nazi domination—and at the same time I do not think we need worry about any possibility of Russian domination" (p. 544). The president's expression of his views was to Admiral Leahy, our representative to Vichy. A great deal of attention is paid here to a justification of our policy of patient understanding combined with pressure on Marshal Petain's government to avoid French collaboration with Germany. An equal amount of attention is paid to a critical examination of the American policy of treating Franco as a potential if not an outright enemy, "a policy . . . stamped by emotion, confused thinking, indecision and lack of coordination. In retrospect . . . one can hardly say much in praise of the American policy toward Spain in 1940 and 1941" (p. 767). One might add that our later dispositions toward France and Spain reflected a development of Roosevelt's deluded state of mind toward communism, for it became increasingly a test of our "sincerity" as regards Russia that we continue to treat Franco as a political leper, and progressively, after benefitting from the favor of Vichyite officials in North Africa, we moved toward a recognition of all anti-Petain forces, including the French communists, as truly and uniquely the French patriots. These were mistakes which are still of consequence in prolonging the process of establishing a united European defense against Soviet imperialism. The British, in complementary but not at all co-ordinated policies with respect to those of the United States, sought to provide Spain with sufficient economic support to maintain that country's independence, but they had no use for Petain; Gaullists and British fought Vichy French armies in the Near East.

Anglo-American views were brought into harmony with respect to the Far East at the time of the Atlantic Conference, after which it was fear of the isolationists, not of Japan, which prevented Roosevelt from issuing an "ultimatum" against that nation's further expansion. However, the decision in favor of a war rather than a settlement in the Far East was probably made in April, when the terms brought to the president's attention by means of the Maryknoll Fathers and Postmaster General Frank Walker were rejected. The Japanese wished to liquidate their four-year-old "China Incident" in a manner that would have meant the restoration of the situation of 1936—with the added requirement that Chiang's Nationalist government co-operate with Japanese forces in fighting the communists in China. The United States was asked to influence Chungking to this end and to see that Japan was guaranteed adequate

metals and petroleum products. Instead, and with a demand that the Japanese break their defensive alliance with Hitler as well as surrender all their special positions in China, the American policy became one of forcing Japan to choose "between climbing down or fighting it out" (pp. 468-469, 708). Roosevelt told the Japanese ambassador that the Chinese communists were not really communists like the Russians. Churchill, on behalf of the British, showed a regard for Chiang's dignity and independence, and the maintenance of the Nationalist cause in China, which for a British statesman was unprecedented and, in the light of what has happened since, very peculiar. Rejection of all Japanese proposals by reference to prerequisite conditions known to be impossible from the Japanese point of view, the completion of plans for a "Victory Program" which included provision for an army of eight million men—to be used against Germany—and immediate preparations with the British and Dutch to resist by force the Japanese attempt to grab the oil and other supplies of the regions of the south Pacific, all to the end that when Japan struck then Hitler would at last declare war on us, tends to prove that no settlement was desired. The "day of infamy" was a result which might have been foreseen by anyone who had a proper understanding of the capabilities of the Japanese navy under circumstances largely arranged by global strategists in the United States. The result was not expected to be the crippling of the United States navy, the loss of Singapore, and the extension of Britain's necessary allocations of force from the Middle to the Far East. Readers are advised to consult Sir Winston Churchill's *Hinge of Fate* (New York, 1950) to get an over-all view of the disaster which followed, something the authors of this series on the world crisis and American foreign policy will have to consider in their next volume.

JOHN T. FARRELL

The Catholic University of America

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The personal papers of Louis A. Lambert (1835-1910), one of the most noted American priests of the late nineteenth century, have been turned over to the Department of Archives and Manuscripts of the Catholic University of America. Lambert was ordained for the Diocese of Alton in 1859 and served as a Civil War chaplain. He was associated briefly with the Paulist Fathers in New York City and in 1869 became pastor at Waterloo, New York, in the Diocese of Rochester. In 1877 he founded the *Catholic Times* which later merged with the Rochester paper of the same name. During the 1880's some referred to him as the "American Newman" for his apologetic writings, which included the books, *Notes on Ingersoll* (1883) and *Tactics of Infidels* (1887). He served as editor of the New York *Freeman's Journal* from 1894 to 1900. His quarrel with Bishop Bernard J. McQuaid was one of the most publicized of episcopal-pastoral misunderstandings of that day. After it was presented to Rome for judgment in 1890, Lambert became pastor at Scottsville, New York.

The Lambert Papers of over 100 letters include press clippings and other documents in lesser quantities. Prominent among them are materials on his answer to the famous agnostic Robert Ingersoll, and those relating to his trouble with Bishop McQuaid. Most interesting of all are twenty items in the correspondence of McQuaid with the Reverend James Early, who was in charge of St. Patrick's Cathedral in Rochester during the bishop's absence at the Vatican Council in 1869-1870. This series of letters, which was preserved in the possession of Father Lambert, describes McQuaid's reactions at the ecumenical gathering. Their publication is planned for an early date.

This accession to the historical manuscript holdings of the University was made possible through the kindness of the Right Reverend Aloysius Quinlan, pastor of the Church of St. Ann in Wildwood, New Jersey, who was a close friend of Father Lambert and the one to whom he entrusted his papers over forty years ago.

The Vatican Secretariate of State announced in the late summer of 1954 that the Holy See has become an official member of the International Congress of Historical Sciences. In view of the approaching tenth session of the congress to be held in Rome from September 4 to 11, 1955, a committee from among the faculties and historical institutes which are dependent exclusively upon the Holy See has been appointed to handle matters relating to the Vatican's participation. The committee is headed by Monsignor Pio Paschini, Rector of the Pontifical Athenaeum of the Lateran, with Monsignor Michel Maccarrone, professor of church history

in the same institution, as secretary. Other members of the committee are Monsignor Angelo Mercati, Prefect of the Vatican Archives, Abbot Pierre Salmon, O.S.B., of the Abbey of St. Jerome, Monsignor Lucien De Bruyne, Rector of the Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology, Ferdinando Antonelli, O.F.M., Rector of the Pontifical Athenaeum Antonianum, Pedro de Leturia, S.J., professor of ecclesiastical history in the Gregorian University, Antonio Casamassa, O.S.A., professor of patrology at the Urban College de Propaganda Fide, and Thomas Käppeli, O.P., Director of the Historical Institute of the Dominican Order. With the exception of Abbot Salmon, Monsignor De Bruyne, and Father Casamassa, the same committee will also act for the Holy See on the International Commission of Ecclestiastical History.

With a view to perpetuating the memory and remarkable achievements in scholarship of Herbert Eugene Bolton (1870-1953) the University of California will establish a memorial in his honor in the form of graduate fellowships for promising young scholars who are interested in the broad field of the history of the Americas, the area which Professor Bolton so peculiarly made his own. The Bolton Fellowships will be open to qualified graduates of any college or university. A group of his friends and former students have been formed into a committee to help raise the funds for these fellowships. Anyone interested in making a contribution may address it to: The Bolton Fellowships, 3303 Dwinelle Hall, University of California, Berkeley 4, California. Readers of the REVIEW do not need to be reminded of the notable contributions which Professor Bolton made to the history of the Catholic Church of the new world in the period of the Spanish Empire. Although he was not of the Catholic faith, his works breathed the deepest sympathy and understanding of the Church and its institutions, and of few men could it be more appropriately said that they deserved the very best that the Catholics of the new world could render to perpetuate their memory and distinguished achievements than it could of this truly great scholar and splendid Christian gentleman.

The History Discussion series for the year 1954-1955 at the University of Notre Dame is being conducted on the theme, "Freedom of Inquiry versus Authority" in the various periods of history. The November discussion on the ancient history period was led by Professor Anton-Hermann Chroust and the Reverend Stanley Parry, C.S.C., and the December discussion on the mediaeval period was led by Canon Astrik Gabriel, O.Praem., and Professor James A. Corbett.

Regis College of Denver has inaugurated a series of historical sketches on its bi-weekly educational program channelled over Station KBTV.

Among those which have been carried to date are the story of the explorer Zebulon Pike which was done by Professor Fred Van Valkenburg, and Lincoln at Gettysburg by William B. Faherty, S.J., co-ordinator of television at Regis. "The Origin of Our Liberties" will be the subject of another presentation by Father Harold L. Stansell, S.J.

Laura E. Kelsay has compiled a 126-page *List of Cartographic Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.* (Special Lists, November 13, National Archives Publication No. 55-1, The National Archives, Washington: 1954). Each item is carefully described and there is an index of proper names.

The Midwest Conference on British Historical Studies was formed at a conference held at the University of Chicago on November 13, 1954. The conference will meet in Chicago once a year, for two days, the first meeting to be held in November, 1955. The officers are: chairman, Herbert Heaton, University of Minnesota; secretary, C. L. Mowat, University of Chicago; program committee, Richard Glover, University of Manitoba, W. B. Willcox, University of Michigan, G. L. Mosse, State University of Iowa, R. B. Eckles, Purdue University. All persons interested in belonging to the conference are invited to send their names, and those of colleagues who might be interested, to C. L. Mowat, University of Chicago.

In the April, 1953, issue of *The Voice* the Reverend William J. O'Shea, S.S., professor of church history in St. Mary's Seminary, Roland Park, in reviewing the biography of Cardinal Gibbons by John Tracy Ellis spoke of the use of the form "James Cardinal Gibbons" as an "indefensible solecism." In that connection it is interesting to note that on May 21, 1954, Pope Pius XII addressed a letter to Cardinal Griffin on the twelfth centennial of the martyrdom of St. Boniface, the opening line of which read: "To Our Beloved Son Bernard Cardinal Griffin, Archbishop of Westminster." [*The Tablet* (London), June 26, 1954.] Since *The Voice* declined to print a letter from Father Ellis concerning the point, it has been thought worthwhile in the interest of accuracy of expression to publish it below.

Editors, *The Voice*
St. Mary's Seminary
Roland Park
Baltimore 10, Maryland
Gentlemen:

At the outset permit me to thank you for the generous space and the attractive presentation which you gave to the review of my biography of Cardinal Gibbons in the April issue of *The Voice*.

In the review Father O'Shea had a number of fine things to say about the work, and I should not wish any of the readers of *The Voice* to think that I am in the position of the grumpy author pictured in the *New York Times Book Review* of May 3 who, slumped down in his chair, is being addressed by his doctor with the words, "There is nothing wrong with you that a good review will not cure!" In his review Father O'Shea was of the opinion that the work suffered from an unevenness of style, that the biography did not convey as vividly as it might the personality of the cardinal, and that more data should have been included on the type of training which Gibbons received at St. Charles College and St. Mary's Seminary. On all these points Father O'Shea was entirely within his rights as a reviewer, since they are matters of personal judgment and preference, not questions of fact.

But on one point, namely, my use of the form "James Cardinal Gibbons" instead of "Cardinal James Gibbons," the reviewer states that in a work of this kind readers might be spared what he terms an "indefensible solecism." According to Father O'Shea cardinals themselves may use the first form but it is incorrect for anyone else to use it in speaking about them. He further states: "This is done only in America, where someone got off to a wrong start in the matter."

May I cite the following in defense of my use of "the indefensible solecism"?

1. "Michael Cardinal Logue," *Irish Catholic Directory and Almanac for 1906* (Dublin, 1906), p. 109.
2. *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman* by Wilfrid Ward (London, 1912).
3. "Henry Edward, Cardinal Manning"
   "Herbert, Cardinal Vaughan"
   "Francis Aidan, Cardinal Gasquet," etc. *The English Catholics, 1850-1950* (London, 1950), edited by George Andrew Beck, A.A., Coadjutor Bishop of Brentwood [pp. 17, 18, 69].

Although it is true that the form of referring to cardinals varies in books published in England and Ireland, the instances cited above would

seem to make it clear that it is not correct to say that placing the Christian name before the title is done "only in America."

Upon inquiry I am informed that the Apostolic Delegation in Washington follows the form used in the life of Cardinal Gibbons in its correspondence with the American cardinals as, for example, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman. Other examples of American books by authors and editors who may be presumed to have exercised care in these details could be cited, but two will suffice: *The Life of John Cardinal McCloskey* by His Eminence, John Cardinal Farley (New York, 1918), and *American Essays for the Newman Centennial*, edited by John K. Ryan and Edmond Darvil Benard (Washington, 1947), which bears the following dedication: "Piae memoriae Joannis Henrici Cardinalis Newman. . . ."

In the *Official Catholic Directory* for the United States (New York, 1952) under the heading, "Ecclesiastical Forms of Address Recognized in the United States," we find: His Eminence (*Christian name*) Cardinal (*Surname*) (p. x). Moreover, in a letter of April 30 to the writer Mr. John A. Cronin, managing editor of the *Official Catholic Directory*, stated: "In the entire period of nearly sixty-seven years since the inclusion of the name of the late Cardinal Gibbons the *Official Catholic Directory* has followed the practise of listing Cardinals with the Christian name preceding the title. . . . Regardless of any practise in other parts of the world, the custom in the United States is that followed by the *Official Catholic Directory*."

I should be grateful if you could spare the space to make the contents of this letter available to readers of *The Voice*.

Yours sincerely in Christ,

(Signed) JOHN TRACY ELLIS

Number 12 of the University of Miami Hispanic-American Studies (Sept., 1954) presents a revision by W. R. Jackson, Jr., of his doctoral dissertation entitled *Early Florida through Spanish Eyes*. He translates passages from Spanish authors on Florida in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from Peter Martyr to Antonio de Herrera. He includes a brief biography of each of his fourteen authors. The translations are well annotated with the notes placed at the end of the study. The volume includes a considerable bibliography and glossary of geographical names.

The *Römische Quartalschrift* has renewed publication after an interruption of eleven years with its forty-eighth *Band* in two issues of 128 pages each. Henceforth it will appear twice a year. The review was founded as a quarterly by the famous archaeologist Anton de Waal in 1887

and continued by John Peter Kirsch. Edited under the auspices of the German house of studies of Campo Santo and the Institute of the Goerres-Gesellschaft in Rome, it is published by Verlag Herder, Freiburg i. Br. at fifteen marks per issue. Two professors of Freiburg, Johannes Kollwitz and Johannes Vincke, will serve as editors, the former for archaeological matter and the latter for church history. Books for review will not be accepted unless they are requested by the editors. The articles will center on matters concerning the papacy and Roman excavations. Among the interesting articles of the present volume is one on the early history of image worship, one on the basilica, one on the evolution of Gregorian chant, and one on the beginnings of papal provisions in Spain. It is to be hoped that American scholars and libraries will support this excellent publication.

The first fascicle (ninety-six pages) of a new *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus* by J. F. Niermeyer has just been published by E. J. Brill (Leiden, 1954, 20 florins). One of its attractive features is that it gives meanings in both English and French. Its quotations are taken mostly from the centuries between 550 and 1150. In connection with them the author endeavors to give modern bibliographical data. He seems to adhere to institutions and may not be of much help to those seeking information on philosophical and theological terms. There will be ten fascicles or more in the completed dictionary, which will make the price very high.

Professor Hal Koch replies to Dr. G. Zuntz's review article of Koch's *Konstantin den Store* (Copenhagen, 1952) in the April number of the *Hibbert Journal*. In the July issue Arnold J. Toynbee replies to Douglas Jerrold's book, *The Lie About the West*, which was written in criticism of Toynbee's *The World and the West*.

The *Theologische Revue*, No. 4/5, 1954, contains a detailed examination by Berthold Altaner of the twenty-two articles in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon, Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Vol. III, edited by Aloys Grillmeier, S.J., and Heinrich Bacht, S.J. (Echterverlag, Würzburg, 1953).

A sumptuous anniversary volume: *St. Bonifatius, Gedenkgabe zum zwölfhundertjährigen Todestag*, has been published by Verlag Parzeller & Co., Fulda. Of particular interest is the article of Georg Wilhelm Sante on "Bonifatius, der Staat und die Kirche."

The inaugural number of *Numen: International Review for the History of Religions* appeared in January, 1954. It will be issued three times a year under the auspices of the International Association for the History of Religions and will carry materials in English, French, German, and Italian. The editor is Professor Raffaele Pettazoni, Via Crescenzio 63, Rome.

With its September issue (Volume VII, Number 12) the *Cambridge Journal* ceases publication because of the steadily mounting cost of production without a proportionate increase in circulation. It set a high ideal for itself:

"It demanded of its contributors that the subjects treated should be of something more than transient interest; so that a future historian, going over the files, would not be reduced to saying that the *Journal* was interesting as illustrating the temper of the times, but might remark that much of its content was relevant to the human condition and the higher human interests of any civilized society."

Père Baudouin de Gaiffier takes the occasion of a review of Father Angel Fábrega Grou's study on the *Pasionaria hispánica* (siglos VII-XI) (Madrid-Barcelona, 1953) to write a distinguished article on "La lecture des actes des martyrs dans la prière liturgique en occident," in *Analecta Bollandiana,* LXXII (1954), Fasc. I-III. Especially welcome is the light he throws on liturgical usages in Spain. Fábrega Grou presented his work as a thesis at the Gregorianum in Rome. His volume describes the extant manuscripts containing the *Passiones* and *Vitae* and analyzes their contents. He plans to publish another volume of texts.

The recent action of the Supreme Court in relation to the first amendment is the subject of a new book by Joseph H. Brady of Seton Hall University. Monsignor Brady's volume (192 pp.) is entitled: *Confusion Twice Confounded,* and offers a documented analysis of the court's decisions in the Everson and McCollum Cases. It has been published by the Seton Hall University Press and will be reviewed later in our journal.

The American Council of Learned Societies *Newsletter,* Vol. 5, No. 3, gives a nineteen-page list of fellowships and grants available to scholars, especially in the humanities.

The International Congress for the History of Religions will hold its eighth session in Rome on April 17-23, 1955. Those interested may communicate with the Italian committee in charge of arrangements at Via Michelangelo 32, Rome.

Father Philip Hughes, the leading Catholic authority on the Protestant Revolt in England, will be a visiting professor of history in the University of Notre Dame during the spring semester of 1955. He will lecture on English history from 1688 to the present, and conduct a seminar on the sixteenth-century religious revolution in England. The third volume of his *The Reformation in England* was published on October 8, 1954.

Canon A. L. Gabriel, Director of the Mediaeval Institute of the University of Notre Dame, in the spring semester of 1954 gave a series of lectures in Europe: an address at the Sorbonne, in French, on the "Illustration of the University *Matricula-s,*" presided over by Pierre Renouvin, Membre de l'Institut, and Charles Samaran, former director of the Archives Nationales; a talk at the International Academy of Science and Letters in Paris, entitled "Hungarians at the University of Paris"; a lecture at the Institut Catholique in Paris on "The Rights and Privileges of Mediaeval Students," introduced by Msgr. Andrieu-Guitraincourt, Dean of the Faculty of Canon Law in Paris; and a talk under the auspices of Free Europe at the College of Free Europe, University of Strasbourg.

At the University of Notre Dame, Aaron I. Abell, who is the current President of the American Catholic Historical Association, has been promoted to the rank of full professor. He has also been appointed chairman of the new program of American Studies. Ralph Weber, instructor in history, has been named Assistant Dean of Arts and Letters at Marquette University. Charles Poinsatte, instructor in history, has been appointed instructor in history at Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame. Boleslaw Szczesniak spent the summer months in the archives and libraries in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal. His study of Michael Boym, Jesuit missionary to China in the seventeenth century, will be published in the near future by the Vatican Press. William O. Shanahan spent the summer months in Germany and Switzerland collecting material for his second volume on the German Protestant social movement. The first volume of the study appeared in September. M. A. Fitzsimons, Acting Director of the Notre Dame Committee on International Relations, will spend the spring and summer semesters in England collecting material for his study of nineteenth-century English politics. The Reverend Edmund Murray, C.S.C., who has been studying since 1951 at the National University of Ireland in both Dublin and Cork, has returned to Notre Dame, where he will offer a course in Irish history and culture.

John Francis Bannon, S.J., chairman of the Department of History in Saint Louis University, has been appointed chairman of the committee on

local arrangements of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association for its forty-eighth meeting which will be held in Saint Louis on April 28-30, 1955.

Recent changes in personnel include the appointment of William J. Schlaerth, S.J., as head of the Department of History at Canisius College, Herbert J. Clancy, S.J., to a similar post at Le Moyne College, Syracuse, and Edward Berbusse, S.J., added to the department at Fordham University.

Joseph S. Brusher, S.J., was appointed chairman of the Department of History in Loyola University, Los Angeles, at the beginning of the current academic year.

John B. McGloin, S.J., formerly of the University of San Francisco, has been appointed to teach history at Loyola University, Los Angeles.

Karl M. Schmitt was awarded his Ph.D. in history last June at the University of Pennsylvania, where he majored in the Ibero-American field. He teaches in the Department of History at Niagara University. An article by him on "The Clergy and the Independence of New Spain" appeared in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* for August.

In Memoriam, L'Abbé Félix Klein (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1954) is a small pamphlet prepared by his friend, Abbé Maurice Nédoncelle, of the University of Strasbourg. Besides containing a touching account of Klein's services to religion and to scholarship, the booklet lists the chief publications of the late abbé, whose death occurred on December 30, 1953.

Urban de Hasque, historian of the Diocese of Oklahoma City-Tulsa, died on September 20 at the age of seventy-nine. Father de Hasque, who was Belgian-born, attended the American College at Louvain, later took a S.T.D. degree in Rome, and was awarded the LL.D. by the University of Notre Dame. He had collected a great deal of material on the Church in Oklahoma since his advent there in 1900 and had written a number of articles. Father de Hasque was a life member of the Oklahoma Historical Society and a member of our own Association since 1936.

Joseph Duhr, S.J., professor of the Jesuit scholasticate at Enghien, Brussels, died on October 12, 1953. His last article, which deals with Pope Formosus, is listed in our Periodical Literature.

Elizabeth Mary Lynskey died after a protracted illness on November 30. She had retired from her chair of political science at Hunter College last May because of ill health and had been named professor emeritus. Miss Lynskey took her M.A. at the University of Minnesota in 1920 and her Ph.D. from the Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Politics in 1929. She had been on the faculty of Hunter College since 1927. Besides writing textbooks, she was the author of a volume of papers on the *Government of the Catholic Church* (1952). She was a member of Phi Beta Kappa. She had been active on committees of the American Catholic Historical Association, was a past vice-president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, and, since 1946, an accredited observer at the United Nations.

William J. Gauche, Rector of St. Gregory Seminary, Cincinnati, died on December 12 at the age of fifty-one. Monsignor Gauche earned his S.T.D. degree in Rome in 1928, and a doctorate in church history at the Catholic University of America in 1934 with a published dissertation on *Didymus the Blind, an Educator of the Fourth Century*. In addition he had a year of post-doctoral study at the University of Fribourg. After his return to Cincinnati in 1935 he taught dogmatic theology and church history in Mount Saint Mary Seminary of the West until his appointment in 1949 as rector of the minor seminary of the archdiocese. He also taught history in Our Lady of Cincinnati College.

The Pilot of Boston is celebrating its 125th anniversary as a Catholic weekly newspaper. It first appeared on September 5, 1829, under the title of *The Jesuit*. In commemoration of the anniversary a supplement was issued in early September containing a series of historical sketches, excerpts from the original issue, and a number of pictures of the early personnel of the paper and of the Church in Boston.

Theologishe Quartalschrift (1954, No. 3), as a tribute to one of its editors, Otto Schilling, professor emeritus of moral theology, and social ethics in the faculty of Catholic theology at the University of Tuebingen, publishes a four-page bibliography of the professor's writings. Retired since 1941 from active teaching, Father Schilling reached his eightieth birthday on October 12, 1954.

Quincy College, Quincy, Illinois, has published an illustrated booklet commemorating the golden jubilee of the Reverend Francis Borgia Steck as a Franciscan. It contains a brief *vita* and a bibliography of Father Steck's writings along with an address in his honor by Paul V. Murray, president of Mexico City College.

Documents: Inedita et Rara: Cento aforismi sulla storia de Francis di Niccolò Tommaseo a cura di P. Ciureanu (*Convivium,* No. 1, 1954).—Inedita et Rara: Dai "Poemata" di Urbano VIII a cura di G. B. Pighi (*ibid.,* No. 2).—Lettere inedite di Saverio Bettinelli A. G. F. Gleani Napione a cura di G. L. Moncallero (*ibid.*).—Tutelle aux mineurs Le Moyne de Longueuil. 1775. Jean-Jacques Lefebvre (*Revue d'histoire de l'amérique française,* Sept.).—A Religious Revival in Tallahassee in 1843, by the Rev. Nathan Hoyt. George C. Osborn (*Fla. Hist. Quar.,* Apr.)—Maine in 1854: Letters on State Politics and Know-Nothingism. (*Records of the Amer. Cath. Histor. Soc. of Phila.,* Sept.).—The Potawatomi Mission, 1854. Hubert Jacobs, S.J. (*Mid-America,* Oct.).—Father Gailland's Letter (*ibid.*).—The Franciscans and the Opening of the Amazon Region. (Ed.) Arthur Cesar Ferreira Reis (*The Americas,* Oct.).

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

Genealogy of Natural Rights. Walker Percy (*Thought*, Autumn).

Renaissance Ideas and the American Catholic Mind. Walter J. Ong (*ibid.*).

Christology and History. Ian Henderson (*Expository Times*, Sept.).

Western Humanism and Catholic Theology. Hugo Rahner, S.J. (*Folia*, No. 1, 1954).

Esplendor y decadencia de la cristiandad. Hernán Benítez (*Revista de la universidad de Buenos Aires*, Jan., 1953).

Orestes Brownson, Montalembert, and Modern Civilization. Leon Bernard (*Histor. Records and Studies*, Vol. XLII, 1954).

Bernanos et l'histoire. Pierre-Henri Simon (*La revue de l'université Laval*, Sept.).

Bilancio de Benedetto Croce. Carmelo Ottaviano (*Sophia*, No. 3-4, 1954).

In margine a "Benedetto Croce e lo storicismo" di F. Olgiati. Emanuele Severino (*Revista di filosofia neoscolastica*, May).

Note sull' Aristotele latine medievale: VIII: I "Primi Analitici"; IX: Gli "Elenchi Sofistici." Lorenzo Minio-Paluello (*ibid.*).

The Revision of Marxism. Sydney D. Bailey (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

Social Justice and Mass Culture. Russell Kirk (*ibid.*).

Sociological Concepts and the International Order. E. K. Francis (*ibid.*).

Teaching Social History. Martin F. Hasting (*Histor. Bull.*, Nov.).

Note sur la date de la sujétion de Joiaqim par Nabuchodonosor. J.-T. Nelis, S.S.S. (*Revue biblique*, July).

"L'heure" de Jean XVII. A. George, S.M. (*ibid.*).

Le temple hérodien d'après la Misnah (suite). L. H. Vincent, O.P. (*ibid.*).

Les graffiti "sinaïtiques" du Wadi Abou Daradj. J. Jomier, O.P. (*ibid.*).

Jakobus von Jerusalem. P. Gaechter (*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 2 Heft, 1954).

The Primacy of St. Peter [Review of *Peter: Disciple-Apostle-Martyr* by Oscar Cullman.] Kevin Smyth, S.J. (*Studies*, Autumn.)

Some Reminiscences of the International Labour Organisation. Edward J. Phelan (*ibid.*).

Kirche und Synagoge in der frühen Auslegung des Roemerbriefes. Karl Hermann Schelkle (*Theologische Quartalschrift*, Drittes Heft, 1954).

Die politische Klausel des Reichskonkordates und ihre rechtliche Tragweite. Eugen Heinrich Fischer (*ibid.*).

Scoperta di una piccola catacomba a Portopalo (Pachine) Santi Luigi Agnello (*Revista de archeologia cristiana*, No. 3-4, 1953).

Die konstantinischen Kirchenbauten nach Eusebius. Ludwig Voelkl (*ibid.*).

Uccelli nei pavimenti musivi delle cappelle funerarie palestinesi. P. B. Bagatti (*ibid.*).

Ueber spaetantik-fruehchristliche Ausgrabungen in der Jacobskirche von Wien-Heiligenstadt. E. Schaffran (*ibid.*).

Iscrizioni sepolcrali da Teano. Alfonso de Franciscis (*ibid.*).

Intorno ad una dedica Damasiana. Antonio Ferrua, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Arnobius und der Marcionitismus. Felix Scheidweiler (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Heft 1-2, 1954).

St. Cyprian and the Papacy: Musings on an Old Problem (Continued). Maurice Bévenot, S.J. (*Dublin Rev.* 3rd quart.).

Enderwartung und himmlischer Stufenbau im Kirchenbegriff des nachapostolischen Zeitalters. Franz-Heinrich Kettler. (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, July).

Zur Chronologie des arianischen Streites. Wilhelm Schneemelcher. (*ibid.*).

Die Heilige Elisabeth im Lichte der Frömmigkeit ihrer Zeit. Wilhelm Maurer (*ibid.*).

Luther und die Marienverehrung. Walter Delius (*ibid.*).

Natale Petri de Cathedra. D. Dante Balboni. (*Ephemerides liturgicae*, Fasc. II, 1954.)

Die Diptychon-Formel für die *Nomina Offerentium* im römischen Messkanon. Alfred Stuiber (*ibid.*).

Il più antico lezionario della chiesa. Giovanni Berti (*ibid.*).

Il II centenario della elevazione a basilica patriarcale e cappella papale della chiesa di S. Francesco in Assisi, "Ordinis Fratrum Minorum caput et mater." A. P. Frutaz (*ibid.*, Fasc. III).

Paléographie et liturgie. Le volume VI des "Codices antiquiores" de E. A. Lowe. Louis Brou (*ibid.*).

Christian Viaticum: A Study of its Cultural Background. Gregory Brabka, O.F.M. (*Traditio*, Vol. IX, 1953).

Chronology of the Fourth-Century Metropolitans of Seleucia-Ctesiphon. Martin J. Higgins (*ibid.*).

Drei unedierte Festpredigten aus der Zeit der nestorianischen Streitigkeiten. Chrysostomus Baur, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Charlemagne and Alcuin: Diplomatic Studies in Carolingian Epistolography. Luitpold Wallach (*ibid.*).

The Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers on Boethius' "De hebdomadibus." Nicholas M. Haring, S.A.C. (*ibid.*).

The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries. Giles Constable (*ibid.*).

Two Notes on Nationalism in the Middle Ages. Gaines Post (*ibid.*).

Arezzo as a Center of Learning and Letters in the Thirteenth Century. Helene Wieruszowski (*ibid.*).

Latin Manuscript Books before 1600, Part II: A Tentative List of Unpublished Inventories of Imperfectly Catalogued Extant Collections. Paul Oskar Kristeller (*ibid.*).

Das Fragment "De paenitentia": ein Teil der Klementinischen Schrift "Quis dives salvetur." Athanas Recheis, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

The Nicene Revolution of 1258 and the Usurpation of Michael VIII Palaeologos. Deno J. Geanakpolos (*ibid.*).

A Note on Functional Linguistics in the Middle Ages. Alfons Nehring (*ibid.*).

The Loherain Cycle: A Project Completed. Jean Misrahi (*ibid.*).

Bibliographical Survey: The History of Ideas in the Christian Middle Ages from the Fathers to Dante in American and Canadian Publications of the Years 1940-1952. Gerhart B. Ladner (*ibid.*).

Zur Frühgeschichte der Bilderverehrung. Johannes Kollwitz (*Römische Quartalschrift*, Bank 48, 1953).

Semeîon ekpetâseos (Didache 16, 6). Eduard Stommel (*ibid.*).

Fabio Chigis Instruktion für den Westfälischen Friedenskongress. Konrad Repgen (*ibid.*).

Die profane und die kirchliche Basilika. Armin von Gerkan (*ibid.*).

Die Entwicklung des christlichen Kultgesangs zum Gregorianischen Gesang. Helmut Hucke (*ibid.*).

Die Anfänge der päpstlichen Provisionen in Spanien. Johannes Vincke (*ibid.*).

Die Antrittsdaten der Rotarichter von 1566-1675. Hermann Hoberg (*ibid.*).

Hans Hoch/Giovanni Alto. Ein schweizerischer Fremdenführer im Rom des 17. Jahrhunderts. Paul Krieg (*ibid.*).

St. Antonin und das Privileg der Steuerfreiheit. Othmar Heggelbacher (*ibid.*).

Notes on the Genuineness of the Constantinian Documents in Eusebius's Life of Constantine. A. H. M. Jones and T. C. Skeat (*Jrn. of Eccles. Hist.*, Oct.).

A Tuscan Monastic Lordship in the Later Middle Ages: Camaldoli. P. J. Jones (*ibid.*).

The Contribution to the Study of the Fathers Made by the Thirteenth Century Oxford Schools. Daniel A. Callus, O.P. (*ibid.*).

Jewish and Christian Ordination. Arnold Ehrhardt. (*ibid.*)

Saint Augustin parmi nous. Henri Rondet, S.J. (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Sept.).

Mediaeval Recensions of Augustine. William M. Green (*Speculum*, July).

The Automata in the Byzantine "Throne of Solomon." Gerard Brett (*ibid.*).

The Pseudo-Isidorian Problem Today. Schafer Williams (*ibid.*, Oct.).

The Art of the Scriptorium at Luxeuil. Robert Branner (*ibid.*).

The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Eleventh Century. John R. Williams (*ibid.*).

Erec and the Joy of the Court. William A. Nitze (*ibid.*).

The Story of Troilus and Criseida according to Benoit and Guido. R. M. Lumiansky (*ibid.*).

The Penetration of Joachism into Northern Europe. Morton W. Bloomfield and Marjorie E. Reeves (*ibid.*).

The Catalan Company and the European Powers, 1305-1311. R. Ignatius Burns, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Saint Augustin et l'esprit de la Somme théologique. F. Cayré (*L'année théologique augustinienne*, Fasc. I-II).

Noción de filosofía en San Agustín. P. Vega, O.E.S.A. (*ibid.*).

Ontologie augustinienne. F.-J. Thonnard (*ibid.*).

Un élève de saint Augustin: Licentius. G. Bardy (*ibid.*).

Les trois catégories de chrétiens. G. Folliet (*ibid.*).

Augustinus und das Mönchtum. A. Zumkeller, O.E.S.A. (*ibid.*).

Saint Grégoire le Grand et Mgr. Duchesne (A propos de la récitation du Pater à la messe). E. Griffe (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, July).

Promotions cardinalices aux xii^{e} et xii^{e} siècles. E. Griffe (*ibid.*).

Mystique ou hystérie [Le cas de Marie-Thérèse Noblet]. E. Delaruelle (*ibid.*).

Histoire événementielle, histoire des structures et histoire religieuse. E. Delaruelle (*ibid.*).

Spanish Patristic Literature: A Continuation of the Aesthetics of the Classics (Conclusion). José Madoz, S.J., tr. by Sr. Margaret Pauline, S.N.D. (*Folia*, No. 1, 1954).

Humble vestige d'un grand espoir deçu. Episode de la vie de Formose. Joseph Duhr, S.J. (*Recherches de science religieuse*, July).

Miscellanea augustiniana. La Croix sur le front. Henri Rondet (*ibid.*).

Une antiphone de saint Ephrem sur l'Eucharistie. Louis Mariès (*ibid.*).

Nuova ipotesi sull' origine dei "temi" bizantini. A. Pertusi (*Aevum*, Mar.).

The Manuscript Tradition of Isidore of Pelusium. Morton Smith (*Harvard Theolog. Rev.*, July).

Sacramentum dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens. Christine Mohrmann. (*ibid.*).

A Note on Josephus, *Antiquities* 15:136. W. D. Davies (*ibid.*).

Le dossier hagiographique de S. Jacques l'Intercis. I. La Passion grecque inédite. Paul Devos (*Analecta Bollandiana*, Fasc. I-II, 1954).

Les vingt-quatre vieillards de l'Apocalypse. A propos d'une liste galloise. Paul Grosjean (*ibid.*).

Thomas de la Hale, moine et martyr à Douvres en 1295. Paul Grosjean (*ibid.*).

Les saints particulièrement honorés à l'abbaye de Saint-Trond. I. Maurice Coens (*ibid.*).

La lecture des actes des martyrs dans la prière liturgique en occident. A propos du passionnaire hispanique. Baudouin de Gaiffier (*ibid.*).

La mort de S. Jean l'Hésychaste d'après un texte géorgien inédit. Gérard Garrite (*ibid.*).

Sainte Hunégonde d'Hombliéres. Son culte et sa vie rythmique. Joseph van den Straeten (*ibid.*).

Ein kleines, aber beachtliches Fragment aus dem Martyrologium Hieronymianum. Alban Dold (*ibid.*).

Un ménologe de Patmos (ms. 254) et ses légendes inédites. François Halkin (*ibid.*).

Les actes inédits de Ste. Charitine, martyre à Corycos en Cilicie. Hippolyte Delehaye (*ibid.*).

A propos de Michel Cérulaire patriarche de Constantinople. Bernard Leib. (*Études*, Sept.).

Pour le centenaire de la naissance de saint Augustin. Gustave Bardy (*ibid.*, Oct.).

900 Jahre Riss zwischen Ost und West. Von Wilhelm de Vries, S.J. (*Stimmen der Zeit*, Sept.).

La déviation de la 4ᵉ Croisade vers Constantinople. Problème d'histoire et de doctrine (deuxième article). A. Frolow (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, July).

Die Kontinuität des Christentums beim Übergang von der Antike zum Mittelalter im Lichte der Glaubensverkündigung des heiligen Bonifatius. Erwin Iserloh. (*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*, Heft 4).

Benedikt von Nursia und die militia Christi nach dem Zeugnis mittelalterlicher Schriftsteller. Suitbert Gammersbach (*ibid.*).

Jonas d'Orléans et le moralisme carolingien. F. Delaruelle (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, July).

Petrus Lombardus. Ludwig Ott (*Müchener theologische Zeitschrift*, No. 2, 1954).

Iconographie fonctionelle. M. M. Lebreton (*Revue des sciences religieuses*, Oct.).

Les idées philosophiques et théologiques de Gersonide (1228-1344) dans ses commentaires bibliques. Ch. Toutati (*ibid.*).

Episcopat et sacerdoce. II, l'opinion de saint Thomas. H. Bouëssé. (*ibid.*).

Chronique: L'Islam hier et aujourd'hui. A. Vincent (*ibid.*).

Viticulture ecclésiastique et viticulture princière au moyen âge. R. Dion (*Revue historique*, July).

A propos des interventions de pape Innocent Ier dans la politique séculière. Emilienne Demougeot (*ibid.*).

O catarismo e a cruzada contra os albigenses. Maria Henriqueta Fonseca. (*Revista de historia*, Jan., 1954.)

A criança da IV écloga e sua educação mistica. Ensaio de interpretação. Jean Gage (*ibid.*).

Natura e prerogative del Sovrano Militare Ordine Gerosolimitano de Malta. S. Lener, S.J. (*La civiltà cattolica*, Oct. 2 and 16).

Alessandro d'Hales O. Min. e le dottrine creazioniste nel medio evo. Pompei, P. Alfonso, O.F.M. Conv. (*Miscellanea Francescana,* July, 1953).

Relazioni tra chiesa e stato secondo S. Ambrogio. P. Felice Cecchini, O.F.M. Cap. (*ibid.*).

La chiesa di S. Francesco dei Frati Minori Conventuali in Molfetta abbattuta nel 1886. Francesco Samarelli (*ibid.*).

Il convento di Monte Rasu dei Frati Minori Conventuali in Sardegna. Costantino Devilla, O.F.M. Conv. (*ibid.*).

Brevi notizie del convento di S. Francesco di Capri dei Frati Minori Conventuali. Giobbe Ruocco. (*ibid.*).

Intorno alle "Glossulae" de S. Antonio al codice di Padova. Giuseppe Piccoli (*ibid.*).

Henrici de Werla, O.F.M. Tractatus de formalitatibus (Introductio). Sophronius Clasen, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies,* Sept.).

Marius of Mercato Saraceno. Dean Corcoran (*Round Table of Franciscan Research,* Oct.).

Het onstaan en de ontwikkeling van de bibliotheek in de Augustijnenkloosters (1256-1329). E. Ypma, O.E.S.A. (*Studia Catholica,* July).

Les vertus morales acquises sont-elles de vraies vertus? La réponse des théologiens de saint Thomas à Pierre Auriol (*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale,* Jan., 1954).

Saint Maxime le Confesseur et la psychologie de l'acte humain. R.-A. Gauthier, O.P. (*ibid.*).

Literargeschichtliches zum lateinischen Moses Maimonides. Wolfgang Kluxen (*ibid.*).

Autorité de la liturgie chez les Pères. Bernard Capelle, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Latinità di Dante: riassunto delle teorie dantesche de E. R. Curtius. Herbert Frenzel (*Convivium,* No. 1, 1954).

Metodo compositorio e centonazione nella lirica del medio evo. Giuseppe Vecchi (*ibid.,* No. 2, 1954).

Il linguaggio biblico nella "Divina Commedia." Giulio Marzot (*ibid.*).

La cultura cristiana nei primi secoli. Michele Pellegrino (*ibid.,* No. 3, 1954).

Il culto dell' Immacolata Concezione nel Carmelo. Claudio Catena, O. Carm. (*Carmelus,* Fasc. 2, 1954).

L'iconographie de l'Immaculée Conception. J. J. M. Timmers (*ibid.*).

Virgo purissima et vita spiritualis Carmeli. Valerius Hoppenbrouwers, O. Carm. (*ibid.*).

Le sermon en langue vulgaire prononcé à Toulouse, par saint Vincent Ferrier le vendredi saint 1416. Clovis Brunel (*Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes,* CXI, 1953).

Le "Corpus Juris civilis" dans le Décret de Gratien, d'après le manuscript lat. nouv. acq. 1761 de la Bibliothèque nationale. Jacqueline Rambaud-Buhot (*ibid.*).

Les cartulaires gascons d'Edouard II, d'Edouard III et de Charles VII. Jean-Paul Trabut-Cussac (*ibid.*).

Renaissance Tendencies in the Religious Thought of Erasmus. Wallace K. Ferguson (*Jrn. of the Hist. of Ideas,* Oct.).

Music in the Culture of the Renaissance. Edward Lowinsky (*ibid.*).

Renaissance Educational Theory, II. Daniel D. McGarry. (*Histor. Bull.,* Nov.).

The Most Beautiful Book of the Fifteenth Century—*Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (Venice, Aldus Manutius, December, 1499). Redmond A. Burke, C.S.V. (*Bull. of the N. Y. Public Library,* Sept.).

L'essere e l'uno in Pico della Mirandola. G. di Napoli (*Revista di filosofia neoscolastica*, July).

L'esistenza di Dio, secondo S. Agostino. P. C. Boyer, S.J. (*ibid.*).

L'Agostinianesimo eterno. A. Gemmeli, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Los autores españoles y la disputa de la Comunión frecuente en los Países Bajos. Jac. Nouwens, M.S.C. (*Analecta sacra Tarraconensia*, July).

Sol intaminatus. A. Olivar, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Religionsfreiheit in Indonesien? P. Gregorius, O.F.M. Cap. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft, Nouvelle revue de science missionnaire*, Heft 3, 1954).

Statistiken der katholischen Kirche in Indonesia. Ludovicus Boddeke, O.F.M. Cap. (*ibid.*).

Das Salsette-Dekret von 1839 und seine Bedeutung für Bombay (Indien) (II). P. Joseph Metzler, O.M.I. (*ibid.*).

François-Maria Halnat (1760-1808) (I). Fernand Combaluzier, C.M. (*ibid.*)

Muhammad et S. François. P. Guilio Basetti-Sani, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

The Historical Position of Communist China: Doctrine and Reality. Karl A. Wittfogel. (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

EUROPEAN

Bulletin historique. Histoire de France au moyen âge (V^e^-XV^e^ siècles). Publications des années 1947-1953 (Ire partie). Robert Boutruche (*Revue historique*, July).

Le dernier seigneur de Beaujeu, Edouard II (1374-1400). Mathieu Méras (*Bibliothèque de l'ecole des chartes*, CXI, 1953).

Nouveaux détails sur la vie et les manuscrits de Pierre de Carcavi. Suzanne Solente (*ibid.*).

Etude archéologique sur l'abbaye de Cercamp. Pierre Héliot (*ibid.*).

Le Conseil des Dépêches sous le règne de Louis XV (à suivre). Michel Antoine (*ibid.*).

Leçon d'ouverture du cours d'histoire des institutions de la France à l'Ecole des Chartes, 3 novembre, 1953. Michel François (*ibid.*).

Was Joan of Arc Charles VII's Sister? Jean Bosler (*Cambridge Jrn.*, Sept.).

Iconoclasm during the French Revolution. Stanley J. Idzerda (*American Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

Men of Letters and *Lettres de Cachet* in the Administration of Cardinal Fleury. Arthur M. Wilson (*ibid.*).

L'abbé d'Astros et la politique religieuse de la restauration en 1815. R. Limouzin-Lamôthe. (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, July.)

The Government and the Press in France during the Reign of Louis-Philippe. Irene Collins (*English Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

French Anticlericalism since the Great Revolution: A Tentative Interpretation. Guillaume de Bertier de Sauvigny, C.J.M. (*Histor. Records and Studies*, Vol. XLII, 1954).

The Crisis in French Foreign Policy. J. B. Duroselle (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

Aspetti dell'organizzazione parocchiale a Padova nel primo trentennio del sec. XIII. Paola Sambin (*Revista di storia della chiesa in Italia*, May, 1953).

L'applicazione a Roma del concilio de Trento. Le visite del 1564-1566. Alberto Monticone (*ibid.*).

Tractatus Iohannis ab Imola super schismate occidentis. Dinus Staffa (*ibid.*).

Benedetto Croce e la letterature comparata in Italia. Franco Simone (*Convivium*, No. 1).

La coscienza storica del Rinascimento francese e il suo significato culturale. Franco Simone (*ibid.*, No. 2.)

Prime edizioni di testi portoghesi medioevali. Giuseppe Carlo Rossi (*ibid.*, No. 4).

Corpus de toponimia catalana: Memoria de los trabajos realizados en el período 1948-52. A. Badía Margarit y Francisco Marsà. (*Pirineos*, No. 25, July, 1952.)

Restos de la iglesia románica de San Cristóbal de Cunit (Tarragona). A. Palomeque Torres (*Revista de archivos bibliotecas y museos.* Nos. 1, 2, and 3, 1953).

La protección del libro bajo Carlos III. Antonio Pérez Rioja (*ibid.*).

Posición de Cervantes ante el gobierno y la administración. Ricardo del Arco Garay (*ibid.*).

Génesis y autenticidad del "Libro de la oración y meditación." Alvaro Huergo, O.P. (*ibid.*).

Aragón y Portugal en la politica de don Alvaro de Luna. Luis Suárez Fernández (*ibid.*).

Notas de diplomática. Luis Sánchez Belda (*ibid.*).

Formación de archivos históricos provinciales. Vicente Salavert Roca (*ibid.*).

El archivo de la antique congregación benedictine de Valladolid. Florentino Pérez y Pérez (*ibid.*).

La confirmación de documentos reales a partir de 1562. Filemón Arribas (*ibid.*).

Notas sobre los del Maestre Racional, Real Audiencia y Justicias. Felipe Matéo Llopis (*ibid.*).

La crónica de la Casa de Blanes de Fray Juan Gaspar Roig y Jalpí. José M. Madureii Marimón (*Analecta sacra Tarraconensia*, July).

Las rentas del estudio general de Lérida. Ramón Gaya Massot (*ibid.*).

Historia de une antigua familia catalana. Los de Bellera. Armando Bellieri (*ibid.*).

Documents inédits sur la politique ifrikiyenne de la Couronne d'Aragon. Charles E. Dufourcq (*ibid.*).

The Capuchins in Castile, Part 3. Juan Florez (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, Oct.).

Los origenes de la Universidad de Salamanca. V. Beltrán de Heredia (*La ciencia tomista*, Jan., 1954).

Irradiación misionera del convento de la Merced de Jerez. Hipólito Sancho de Sopranis. (*Missionalia Hispanica*, No. 31.)

Traida de libros y vestuarios en el siglo XVI de los misioneros desde sus conventos a Sevilla, pagada por el tesoro de la Casa de la Contratación (II. Domínicos). José Castro Seoane, O. de M. (*ibid.*).

Portugal: An Island of Political, Economic and Social Stability (concluded). S. Bolshakoff (*Social Justice Rev.*, Oct.).

Hugo de Groot in dienst van de verdediging der Moederkerk. P. Polman, O.F.M. (*Studia Catholica*, Apr.).

Nieuwe argumenten voor S. Willibrord's missiearbeid in Antwerpen en Noord-Brabant? R. Port (*ibid.*, July).

Het begin van de Redemptoristische volksmissies in Nederland. M. H. Mulders, C.SS.R. (*ibid.*).

Die Anfänge der Laurentiusverehrung und die Laurentiuskirche in Trier. Peter Franz Schmidt (*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*, Heft 5, 1954).

Germany in Retrospect. John Murray (*Studies*, Autumn).

A Note on Bishop Jón Arason. Tryggvi J. Oleson (*Speculum*, July).

Mittelalterliche Fresken aus Jugoslawien. Herbert Schade, S.J. (*Stimmen der Zeit*, Sept).

Two Anniversaries of Serbian Law: The Civil Code of 1844 and the Zakonik of Dushan. Lazare Marcovitch (*Jrn. of Central European Affairs*, Oct.).

On "Human Rights" in Czechoslovakia. Peter Zenkl (*ibid.*).

Slovakia under Communist Rule, "Democratic Centralism versus National Autonomy." Eduard Táborský (*ibid.*).

Was Thomas Masaryk's "Austria delenda est!" a Mistake? William J. Rose (*ibid.*).

The Early Years of the Polish Peasant Party, 1895-1907. Peter Brock (*ibid.*).

Polemiche letterarie in U.R.S.S. U. A. Floridi, S.J. (*La civiltà cattolica*, Oct. 16).

Lenin's Assumption of International Proletarian Leadership. Stanley W. Page (*Jrn. of Mod. Hist.*, Sept.).

Freedom of Cultural Activities in the Soviet Union. Casimir C. Gecys (*Ukrainian Quar.*, Summer, 1954).

Carpatho-Ukraine under Hungarian Occupation (1939-1944). Vasyl Markus (*ibid.*).

Dissolving of the Church Organization in Countries behind the "Iron Curtain." Th. J. Zubek, O.F.M. (*Homiletic and Pastoral Rev.*, Nov.).

ENGLISH, SCOTCH, IRISH

The Patrimony of St. Cuthbert. Sir Edmund Craster (*English Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

The Historical Value of the Lives of St. Finnian of Clonard. Kathleen Hughes (*ibid.*, July).

Robert of Abingdon and Matthew Paris. C. H. Lawrence (*ibid.*).

The Barons' Argument at Amiens, January, 1264. P. Walne (*ibid.*).

Osbert, Dean of Lewes. V. H. Galbraith (*ibid.*, Apr.).

The Date of the Geld Rools. J. F. A. Mason (*ibid.*).

The Terrae Occupatae of Cornwall and the Exon Domesday. Robert S. Hoyt (*Traditio*, Vol. IX, 1953).

The Finances of the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Century: A Preliminary Survey. Kathleen Major (*Jrn. of Eccles. Hist.*, Oct.).

Contemporary Views on the Proposals for the Alienation of Capitular Property in England (1832-1840). P. J. Welch (*ibid.*).

Three Letters of William of Thetford, O.P. K. W. Humphreys (*ibid.*).

Two Letters of William Laud. William Kellaway (*ibid.*).

The Feudal Antecedent of the Indenture System. Bryce D. Lyon (*Speculum*, July).

Author's Revision in Block C. of the *Canterbury Tales*. J. Burke Severs (*ibid.*).

Inalienability: A Note on Canonical Practice and the English Coronation Oath in the Thirteenth Century. Ernest H. Kantorowicz (*ibid.*).

The Lay of Sorrow and *The Lufaris Complaynt*: an Edition. Kenneth G. Wilson (*ibid.*, Oct.).

The Pagham Estates of the Archbishops of Canterbury during the Fifteenth Century. F. R. H. Du Boulay (*History*, Oct. 1953).

Some Protestant Views of Early British Church History. Glanmor Williams (*ibid.*).

An Experiment in the Application of an Environmental Study to the Teaching of History. J. E. Short and J. H. Cook (*ibid.*).

Cranmer and the Liturgy of 1552. E. C. E. Bourne (*Church Quar. Rev.*, Oct.).

The Catholic Contribution to Liverpool Education in the 18th Century. Mina J. Moore-Rinvolucri (*Dublin Rev.*, 3rd quar.).

Letters of Phillipps de Lisle to Montalembert (continued). Louis Allen (*ibid.*).

"Scientific" Whiggism: Adam Smith and John Millar. Duncan Forbes. (*Cambridge Jrn.*, Aug.).

Newman at Birmingham. John M. Render, C.P. (*Amer. Eccles Rev.*, Nov.).

The Death of Red Hugh O'Donnell. Canice Mooney, O.F.M. (*Irish Eccles. Rev.*, May).

Origins of the Catholic University of Ireland, 1845-1854. Mary D. Vale (*ibid.*, July).

The Trial of Oliver Plunkett. Alice Curtayne (*ibid.*).

The Place of Irish Saints in Medieval English Calendars. John Hennig (*ibid.*, Aug.).

The Treaty of Limerick. Christopher Preston (*ibid.*).

Catholic Church Building in Scotland from the Reformation until the Outbreak of the First World War, 1560-1914. Peter F. Anson (*Innes Rev.*, Autumn, 1954).

Provost Skene's House, in Aberdeen, and Its Catholic Chapel. David McRoberts (*ibid.*).

Notes on a Printed Monastic Breviary Used at Arbroath Abbey. J. B. L. Tolhurst, F.S.A. (*ibid.*).

James Gibbs, Architect, 1682-1754. Alexander S. MacWilliam (*ibid.*).

New Light on John Major. James H. Burns (*ibid.*).

The Interrelation of Agriculture and Industry in the Irish Economy. James J. Byrne (*Studies*, Autumn).

AMERICAN

Catholic Serials in the 19th Century in the United States. A Bibliographical Survey and a Union List. Eugene P. Willging and Herta Hatzfeld (*Records of the Amer. Cath. Histor. Soc. of Phila.*, Sept.).

Catholicism, Americanism, Democracy, and Orestes Brownson. Carl F. Krummerl (*American Quar.*, Spring, 1954).

The Human Person in Recent Papal Messages, Do They Apply to American Society? Joseph P. Fitzpatrick (*Thought*, Autumn, 1954).

Skepticism and Historical Faith of Charles Beard. Whitaker T. Deininger (*Jrn. of the Hist. of Ideas*, Oct.).

The Paxton Boys: Parkman's Use of the Frontier Hypothesis. Dean Moor (*Mid-America*, Oct.).

Translation of Gailland's Letter. Jerome V. Jacobsen (*ibid.*).

A Meaning for Turner's Frontier I: Democracy in the Old Northwest. Stanley Elkins and Eric McKitrick (*Political Science Quar.*, Sept.).

Black-Robe Frontiersman: Gabriel Marest, S.J. (1662-1714). John Francis Bannon (*Bull. Mo. Hist. Soc.*, Apr.).

The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement: A Re-evaluation. Frederick B. Tolles (*American Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

The Shaping of the American Tradition. Clinton Rossiter (*William and Mary Quar.*, Oct.).

Catholics and Freemasons—Not Now—Then. Laurence J. Kenny (*Histor. Bull.*, Nov.).

The Jesuit Colony in New York, 1808-1817. Francis X. Curran, S.J. (*Histor. Records and Studies*, Vol. XLII, 1954).

Most Reverend William Gross: Missionary Bishop of the South. Andrew Skeabeck, C.SS.R. (*Records of the Amer. Cath. Histor. Soc. of Phil.*, Sept.).

The Polish Immigrant in Philadelphia to 1914. Sr. M. Theodosetta Lewandowska, S.F.N. (*ibid.*).

Early Days of the University of Dayton: Excerpts from the Chronicles of Nazareth. George Ruppel, S.M., Ed. (*Ohio State Archeolog. and Histor. Quar.*, Oct.).

German Instruction in the Public Schools of Indianapolis, 1869-1919, II. Francis H. Ellis (*Indiana Mag. of Hist.*, Sept.).

The Impact of Business on Protestantism, 1900-29. William T. Doherty (*Bus. Hist. Rev.*, June).

Graduate Theses relating to Missouri (*Mo. Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

Madame Sophie Sosnowski. Mary Morris Miller (*Ga. Histor. Quar.*, Sept.).

Churches in the Alabama Black Belt, 1875-1917. Glenn N. Sisk (*Church Hist.*, June).

Louisiana Socialists in the Early Twentieth Century: A Study of Rustic Radicalism. Grady McWhiney (*Jrn. of Southern Hist.*, Aug.).

Presbyterians and the Relation of Church and State. William B. McAlpin (*Jrn. of the Presbyterian Histor. Soc.*, Sept.).

Religion, Morality, and Freedom: The Ideological Background of the Perry Expedition. William L. Neumann (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).

Les évêques de Bas-Canada et le projet d'union (1840). Léon Pouliot, S.J. (*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Sept.).

L'annedda et l'arbre de vie. Jacques Rousseau (*ibid.*).

Cartier en Nouvelle-France en 1524. Gustave Lanctot (*ibid.*).

A la recherche de la Mer du Nord: 1661. Soeur Marie de Saint-Jean d'Ars, C.S.C. (*ibid.*).

Le musée de la cathédrale de Moncton—ses souvenirs historiques. Marguerite Michaud (*ibid.*).

L'Ile aux Tourtres, avant-poste de peuplement. Robert-Lionel Segiun (*ibid.*).

Prudent-L. Mercure a-t-il écrit l'histoire de Madawaska? J.-A. Robert Pichette (*ibid.*).

Une campagne de l'apostat Chiniquy en 1859. Marcel Trudel (*La revue de l'université Laval*, Nov.).

A Dutch Trade Mission to New Spain, 1746-1747. Peter Herhard (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).

The Case of *Some* Inhabitants of East Florida, 1767-1785. Barbara Gorely Teller (*Fla. Histor. Quar.*, Oct.).

The Influence of Travel Books on Early American Hispanism. Frederick S. Stimson. (*The Americas*, Oct.).

Congressional Reaction in the United States to the Panama Congress of 1826. Ralph Sanders (*ibid.*).

Some Historical Values in a Famous Mexican Novel. Frank A. Knapp, Jr. (*ibid.*).

Spanish Medieval Institutions in Overseas Administration: The Prevalence of Medieval Concepts. Carlos E. Casteñeda (*ibid.*).

Cattolici e protestanti in Colombia. G. Caprile, S.J. (*La civiltà cattolica*, Oct. 2).

Nella cattolica Colombia: terrorismo "in nome de Cristo Re"? G. Caprile, S.J. (*ibid.*, Oct. 16).

A segunda fundação de São Paulo. De pequeña cidade à grande metròpole de hoje. E. Simões de Paulo (*Revista de historia*, Jan., 1954) .

A fundação de São Paulo pelos jesuitas. Hélio Abranches Viotti, S.J. (*ibid.*).

O território da Conônia do Sacramento e a formação dos estados platinos. Jaime Cortesão (*ibid.*).

Nuevos incidentes en las misiones del Paraguay hasta el final de la demarcación de los limites (1757-1760). Francisco Mateos, S.J. (*Missionalia Hispanica*, No. 31).

Valera, la heterodizoa y la hispanidad. Leonardo de Aldama (*Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires*, Jan., 1953).

La obra de Cajal y la leyenda negra. Juan Nasio (*ibid.*, Apr.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Adam, Karl. *The Spirit of Catholicism.* (New York: Doubleday Image Books. 1954. Pp. xii, 260. $.75.)

Albornoz, Claudio Sánchez. *El canciller ayala, historiador,* I (1953), No. 2. (Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Argentina. Pp. 33.)

A National Program for the Publication of Historical Documents. A Report to the President by the National Historical Publications Commission. (Washington: General Services Administration. 1954. Pp. vii, 106. $.50.)

Bald, F. Clever. *Michigan in Four Centuries.* (New York: Harper and Bros. 1954. Pp. xii, 498. $4.00.)

Baudrillart, Alfred, (Ed.), continué par A. De Meyer et Van Cauwenbergh. *Dictionnaire de géographie et d'histoire ecclesiastiques. Fascicule LXXV. Consalvi-Constantinople.* (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané. 1954. Cols. 513-768.)

Beloff, Max. *The Age of Absolutism, 1660-1815.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc. 1954. Pp. ix, 191. Text edition, $1.80; trade edition, $2.40.) Mr. Beloff is a Fellow of Nuffield College, Oxford. The present volume is one of Hutchinson's University Library of History.

Berdyaev, Nicolas. *Christianity and Anti-Semitism.* With a commentary and Notes by Alan A. Spears. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1954. Pp. 58. $2.75.)

Bernanos, Georges. *The Diary of a Country Priest.* (New York: Doubleday Image Books. 1954. Pp. 232. $.65.)

Bodo, John R. *The Protestant Clergy and Public Issues. 1812-1846.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1954. Pp. xiv, 291. $5.00.)

Bokser, Ben Zion. *From the World of the Cabbalah.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1954. Pp. ix, 210. $3.00.)

Bolgar, R. R. *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1954. Pp. vii, 592. $8.50.)

Bonsirven, Joseph, S.J., (Ed.). *Epitres de Saint Jean.* Vol. IX, *Verbum Salutis.* (Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils. 1954. Pp. 280.) This is an entirely revised edition of a work which originally appeared in 1936. Father Bonsirven is a professor in the Pontifical Biblical Institute at Rome.

Boxer, C. R., (Ed.). *South China in the Sixteenth Century.* Second Series No. CVI. (London: Hakluyt Society. 1953. Pp. xci, 388.)

Brady, Joseph H. *Confusion Twice Confounded, the First Amendment and the Supreme Court. An Historical Study.* (South Orange: Seton Hall University Press. 1954. Pp. 192.)

Bulletin bibliographique de la société des écrivains canadiens. Anneé 1953. (Montreal: Editions de la société des écrivains canadiens. 1953. Pp. 126. $1.00.) This is the seventeenth volume in the series compiled by Mlle. Marguerite Chartraud. It includes mention of 265 works which appeared during 1953.

Burke, Thomas J. M., S.J. (Ed.). *Mary and Modern Man.* (New York: America Press. 1954. Pp. xvi, 231. $3.50.) This volume contains ten essays on various aspects of doctrine and devotion to our Lady by as many authors.

Burr, Nelson R. *The Anglican Church in New Jersey.* (Philadelphia: Church Historical Society. 1954. Pp. xvi, 768. $10.00.)

Burton, Katherine. *Children's Shepherd. The Story of John Christopher Drumgoole, Father of the Homeless.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1954. Pp. viii, 236. $3.75.)

Colum, Padraic, (Ed.). *A Treasury of Irish Folklore. The Stories, Traditions, Legends, Humor, Wisdom, Ballads and Songs of the Irish People.* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc. 1954. Pp. x, 620. $5.00.)

Connolly, Myles. *Mr. Blue.* (New York: Doubleday Image Books. 1954. Pp. 119. $.50.)

Contemporary Civilization Staff of Columbia College, Columbia University. *Introduction to Contemporary Civilization in the West. A Source Book,* Vol. I. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1954. Pp. x, 1284. $6.75.) This is the second edition of the source book prepared by the contemporary civilization staff of Columbia College which appeared originally in 1946.

Coonan, Thomas L. *The Irish Catholic Confederacy and the Puritan Revolution.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1954. Pp. xviii, 402. $6.00.)

Cooper, James Fenimore. *The Leatherstocking Saga.* Edited by Allan Nevins; illustrated by Reginald March. (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1954. Pp. x, 833. $8.50.)

Culkin, Gerard. *The English Reformation.* (London: Paternoster Publications. 1954. Pp. 105. $.84.) This slender volume by the professor of church history in Ushaw College, Durham, offers a splendid summary of the outstanding features of the sixteenth-century religious revolt in England. The foreword is written by the Right Reverend John C. Heenan, Bishop of Leeds. There are suggestions for further reading and notes to the principal sources in the text.

Curtayne, Alice. *St. Brigid of Ireland.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1954. Pp. 122. $2.00.)

Davis, R. H. C., (Ed.). *The Kalendar of Abbot Samson of Bury St. Edmunds and Related Documents.* (London: Royal Historical Society. 1954. Pp. lx, 200.)

Davis, William L., S.J. *A History of St. Ignatius Mission.* (Spokane: W. L. Davis, S.J. 1954. Pp. x, 147. $2.00.)

Dawley, Powell Mills. *John Whitgift and the English Reformation.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1954. Pp. xii, 254. $3.00.)

de Mézières, Philippe. *The Life of Saint Peter Thomas. Edited from Hitherto Unpublished Manuscripts with an Introduction and Notes by Joachim Smet, O. Carm.* [Textus et Studia Historica Carmelitana. Vol. III.] (Roma: Institutum Carmelitanum. 1954. Pp. 242.)

Dickson, Harold E. *A Hundred Pennsylvania Buildings.* (State College: Bald Eagle Press. 1954. Pp. 100. n.p.) This volume contains 100 handsome photographs of historical buildings that have had a prominent place in state affairs. The publication of this volume was made possible by a grant-in-aid from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Collection.

Dodd, Bella V. *School of Darkness.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1954. Pp. 264. $4.00.) This is the story of a woman who was once a Catholic, then a member of the American Communist Party's national committee, and then once more a Catholic after her expulsion from the party in 1949.

Durkin, Joseph T., S.J. *Stephen Mallory, Confederate Navy Chief.* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1954. Pp. xi, 446. $6.00.)

Dutilly, Arthème, O.M.I., *et al. Contribution à la flore du versant occidental de la Baie James, Ontario.* (Washington: Catholic University of America. 1954. Pp. 144.)

Fabre, Lucien. Translated by Gerard Hopkins. *Joan of Arc.* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc. 1954. Pp. 367. $5.00.)

Ehler, Sidney Z., and John B. Morrall (Ed. and Trans.). *Church and State through the Centuries.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1954. Pp. xiv, 625. $6.75.)

Epstein, Leon D. *Britain-Uneasy Ally.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1954. Pp. viii, 279. $4.00.) Mr. Epstein is associate professor of political science in the University of Wisconsin. His detailed examination of the British policies and public opinion toward the United States in the years 1945-1952 offers a very timely aid to those concerned over the recent rift in Anglo-American relations. The volume has been published under the auspices of the Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy at the University of Chicago.

Fairweather, (Trans. and Ed.). *Nature and Grace. Selections from the Summa Theologica of Thomas Aquinas.* [Vol. XI, Library of Christian Classics.] (Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1954. Pp. 386. $5.00.) Mr. Fairweather is a lecturer in philosophy at the University of Edinburgh.

Farrow, John. *Damien the Leper.* (New York: Doubleday Image Books. 1954. Pp. 234. $.65.)

Federal Statistical Office (Ed.). *Statistical Pocket-Book on Expellees in the Federal Republic of Germany and West Berlin.* (Wiesbaden: Federal Statistical Office. 1953. Pp. xii, 115. n.p.)

Flexner, James Thomas. *The Light of Distant Skies.* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1954. Pp. 306. $10.00.)

Germany Reports. (Wiesbaden, Wiesbadener Graphische Betriebe GmbH. 1953. Pp. 367. $3.00.) This volume covers all aspects of life in West Germany and provides authentic factual data covering all fields. There are eighty-one charts, eighty-four tables, and forty-seven full page photographic reproductions.

Forrestal, Peter P., C.S.C. (Trans.). *Benavides' Memorial of 1630.* (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History. 1954. Pp. xxv, 96. $4.00.)

Gatzke, Hans W. *Stresemann and the Rearmament of Germany.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1954. Pp. 132. $3.00.)

Gilson, Etienne (Ed.). *The Church Speaks to the Modern World—The Social Teachings of Leo XIII.* (New York: Doubleday Image Books. 1954. Pp. viii, 348. $.95.)

Gipson, Lawrence Henry. *The Coming of the Revolution, 1763-1775.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1954. Pp. xiv, 287. $5.00.)

Grimm, Harold J. *The Reformation Era, 1500-1650.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1954. Pp. xiii, 675. $6.50.)

Gross, Feliks. *Foreign Policy Analysis.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1954. Pp. xxiv, 179. $3.75.)

Guardini, Romano. *The Lord.* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1954. Pp. xi, 535. $6.50.)

Hafford, Gabriel Ward and George Kolanda. *The Christian Life Calendar, 1955.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1954. $1.00.)

Hayes, Carlton J. H. *Christianity and Western Civilization.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1954. Pp. vii, 63. $2.50.)

Hazard, Paul. *European Thought in the Eighteenth Century from Montesquieu to Lessing.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1954. Pp. xx, 477. $6.00.)

Herbst, Clarence A. (Trans.). *The Letters of Saint Margaret Mary Alacoque.* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1954. Pp. xxxiv, 286. $5.00.)

Herrick, Jane. *The Historical Thought of Fustel de Coulanges. A Dissertation.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1954. Pp. 144. $1.75.)

Huby, Joseph, S.J. *L'évangile et les évangiles.* [Verbum Salutis. Vol. XI.] (Paris: Beauchesne et Ses Fils. 1954. Pp. ix, 304, n.p.) This is a new and enlarged edition of Father Huby's work by Xavier Léon-Dufour, S.J., a professor at the Jesuit Scholasticate of Enghien.

Hughes, Philip. *A Popular History of the Catholic Church.* (New York: Doubleday Image Books. 1954. Pp. ix, 309. $.85.)

Hughes, Philip. *The Reformation in England,* Vol. III. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1954. Pp. xxix, 457. $7.50.)

Jerrold, Douglas. *The Lie About the West. A Response to Professor Toynbee's Challenge.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1954. Pp. 85. $1.75.) This slender volume caused considerable stir when it first appeared in England. Mr. Jerrold challenged the thesis of Toynbee's Reith Lectures, which were published under the title of *The World and the West.* The challenge embodies a defense of western Christian civilization as something unique in human history and not, as Toynbee maintained, merely one among a number of other secular civilizations which have had their day and have come to an end.

Johnson, Samuel A. *The Battle Cry of Freedom.* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press. 1954. Pp. ix, 357. n.p.)

Jorgensen, Johannes. Ingeborg Lund (Trans.). *Saint Bridget of Sweden,* Vol. I, *1303-1349;* Vol. II, *1349-1373.* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd. 1954. Pp. xiii, 310; ix, 354. 2 vol. set $8.50.)

Just, Sister Mary. *Rome and Russia.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1954. Pp. xiii, 223. $3.00.)

Kaps, Johannes (Ed.), Gladys H. Hartinger (Trans.). *The Tragedy of Silesia 1945-46. A Documentary Account with a Special Survey of the Archdiocese of Breslau.* (Munich: "Christ Unterwegs." 1952/53. Pp. 576. n.p.)

Kilman, Ed and Theon Wright. *Hugh Roy Cullen. A Story of American Opportunity.* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1954. Pp. viii, 376. $4.00.) This is a biography of a Texas oil king by two newspaper men who have known for many years Mr. Cullen and the country wherein he grew up and worked out his highly successful career.

Korbel, Josef. *Danger in Kashmir.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1954. Pp. xvi, 351. $5.00.) This volume emphasizes the further threat to Asia from the communists neighboring on Kashmir. The author is professor of international relations in the University of Denver. The foreword has been written by Admiral Nimitz.

Laures, Johannes, S.J. *Takayama Ukon und die Anfänge der Kirche in Japan.* (Münster Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1954. Pp. xii; 397. CM. 26.-)

Lavelle, Louis. *The Meaning of Holiness.* (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1954. Pp. vi, 113. $2.75.) Before his death Louis Lavelle was a professor of philosophy at the Sorbonne and Henri Bergson's successor at the Collège de France. In this slender volume he used SS. Francis of Assisi, Teresa of Avila, John of the Cross, and Francis de Sales to exemplify his theories of holiness.

Lázaro, Orlando. "Alejandro Heredia y la educacion primaria en Tucumán (1832-1838)," a reprint from *Revista de la facultad de filosofía y letras,* I, (1953), No. 1. (Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Argentina. Pp. 8. n.p.)

Leslie, Shane. *Cardinal Manning.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1954. Pp. xxiii, 226. $3.75.)

Loossky, Andrew. *Louis XIV, William III, and the Baltic Crisis of 1683.* [Vol. XLIX, University of California Publications in History.] (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1954. Pp. xi, 73. $1.00.) This slender monograph is based in part on a chapter of the author's doctoral dissertation at Yale University, where he was a student of Hajo Holborn.

McArdle, Sister Mary Aurelia, S.M. *California's Pioneer Sister of Mercy, Mother Mary Baptist Russell (1829-1898).* (Fresno: Academy Library Guild. 1954. Pp. 204. $6.00.)

McDonald, Sister M. Justille. *History of the Irish in Wisconsin in the Nineteenth Century.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1954. Pp. ix, 324. $3.50.)

McDonnell, Ernest W. *The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1954. Pp. xvii, 643. $10.00.)

McLaughlin, P. J., D. ès Sc. *Modern Science and God.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1954. Pp. 89. $2.75.) An analysis of the allocution of Pope Pius XII to the Pontifical Academy of Science on November 22, 1951, by a professor at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

McNeill, John T. *Modern Christian Movements.* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1954. Pp. 197. $3.50.)

McSorley, Joseph. *Outline History of the Church by Centuries. (From St. Peter to Pius XII.)* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1954. Pp. xxxii, 1174. $9.00.) This is the ninth edition, newly revised, of Father McSorley's popular history of the Church. This ninth edition devotes a chapter of 200 pages to the Church in the twentieth century with particular attention given to events during and since World War II.

Mann, Arthur. *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1954. Pp. x, 314. $5.00.)

Maritain, Jacques. Edward H. Flannery (Trans.). *An Essay on Christian Philosophy.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1954. Pp. xi, 116. $2.75.)

Maynard, Theodore. *Saint Benedict and His Monks.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1954. Pp. xiv, 241. $3.00.)

Mélanges Saint Bernard. XXIV^{e} Congrés de l'Association Bourguignonne des Sociétés Savantes (8^{e} Centenaire de la most de Saint Bernard). (Dijon: Abbé Marilier. 1953. Pp. 435. 900 frs.)

Misiak, Henryk and Virginia M. Staudt. *Catholics in Psychology. A Historical Survey.* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1954. Pp. xv, 309. $5.00.)

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *History of United States Naval Operations in World War II,* Vol. IX, *Sicily—Salerno—Anzio, January, 1943—June, 1944.* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1954. Pp. xxix, 413. $6.00.)

Mörner, Magnus. *The Political and Economic Activities of the Jesuits in the La Plata Region.* (Stockholm: Ibero-Amerikanska Biblioteket ock Institutet. 1953. Pp. xv, 254. $5.50.)

Mousel, Sister Mary Eunice, O.S.F. *They Have Taken Root.* (New York: Bookman Associates. 1954. Pp. xix, 384. $5.00.)

Notestein, Wallace. *The English People on the Eve of Colonization, 1603-1630.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1954. Pp. xvii, 302. $5.00.)

Nugent, Francis Edward (Ed.). *Father McNabb Reader.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1954. Pp. xvi, 227. $3.50.) This volume of essays with selections of verse, retreat conferences, etc., of the late Vincent McNabb, O.P., has been edited by Francis Edward Nugent of St. Mary's Seminary, Roland Park, Baltimore, and contains a foreword by Hilary Carpenter, O.P., provincial of the English Dominicans.

O'Hanlon, Sister M. Assumpta, O.P. *St. Dominic, Servant But Friend.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1954. Pp. ix, 182. Cloth, $3.50; paper, $2.00.) This brief and popular life of St. Dominic seeks to point out certain parallels between the events of Dominic's lifetime and our own age. Reference is made in footnotes to some of the standard Dominican works but there is no bibliography or index.

Ospina, Eduardo, S.J. *The Protestant Denominations in Colombia.* (Bogotà: National Press. 1954. Pp. 212.)

Oulton, John E. L. and Henry Chadwick (Trans. and Eds.). *Alexandrian Christianity. Selected Translations of Clement and Origen with Introductions and Notes.* [Vol. II, Library of Christian Classics.] (Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1954. Pp. 475. $5.00.) John Oulton is Regius professor of divinity in the University of Dublin, and Henry Chadwick is a Fellow and the Dean of Queens' College, Cambridge.

Oursler, Fulton. *Lights Along the Shore.* (New York: Hanover House. 1954. Pp. 348. $2.95.) This volume contains over forty essays, stories, and articles of the late Fulton Oursler, gathered from the numerous publications by several persons who were very close to the author in his years as a writer.

Parks, George B. *The English Traveler to Italy,* Vol. I, *The Middle Ages (to 1525).* (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1954. Pp. xx, 669. $10.00.)

Pike, Royston. *Jehovah's Witnesses. Who They Are. What They Teach. What They Do.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1954. Pp. 140. $2.75.)

Potter, David M. *People of Plenty. Economic Abundance and the American Character.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1954. Pp. xxvii, 219. $3.50.)

Price, W. J. H. *Corneille-François de Nelis—18e et dernier évêque d'Anvers (1785-1798)—un évêque humaniste et homme d'action à la fin de l'ancien régime.* (Louvain: E. Nauwelaerts. 1954. Pp. xlii, 381. $7.00.)

Reynolds, James A. *The Catholic Emancipation Crisis in Ireland—1823-29.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1954. Pp. viii, 204. $3.75.)

Riggs, Charles T. (Trans.). *History of Mehmed the Conqueror.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1954. Pp. ix, 222. $5.00.) This is the first translation into English of the Greek text of Kritovoulus, a Byzantine, who started the biography of the man who conquered Constantinople in 1453. Mr. Riggs, the translator, died in February, 1953, while teaching at Robert College in modern Istanbul.

Roberts, Archbishop, S.J. *Black Popes. Authority: Its Use and Abuse.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1954. Pp. x, 139. $2.50.) In this volume the former Archbishop of Bombay puts forth some challenging ideas concerning authority, with a chapter on the Ignatian concept of authority, as well as interesting examples taken from the cases of St. Celestine V and the suppression of the Jesuits by Clement XIV. Archbishop Roberts is now in residence at Campion Hall, Oxford. The book contains fourteen brief chapters; there is no bibliography or index.

Rouse, Ruth and Stephen Charles Neill (Ed.). *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948.* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1954. Pp. xxiv, 822. $9.90.)

Runciman, Steven. *A History of the Crusades.* Vol. III. *The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1954. Pp. xii, 530. $6.50.)

Russell, Lord, of Liverpool. *The Scourge of the Swastika. A Short History of Nazi War Crimes.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1954. Pp. xii, 250. $4.50.) Lord Russell, as deputy judge advocate general of the British Army of the Rhone, was legal adviser to the commander-in-chief in regard to all trials of German war criminals in the British zone of occupation.

Ryan, Paul E. *History of the Diocese of Covington, Kentucky.* (Covington: Diocese of Covington. 1954. Pp. 1054.)

Saint-Pierre, Michel de. *Bernadette and Lourdes.* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Young. Pp. xvi, 267. $3.50.)

Sandburg, Carl. *Abraham Lincoln.* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1954. Pp. xiv, 762. $7.50.)

Sante, Georg Wilhelm. *Bonifatius, der Staat und die Kirche, Sonderdruck aus St. Bonifatius. Gedenkgabe zum zwölfhundertjahrigen Todestag.* (Fulda: Verlag Parzeller & Co. Pp. 197-226.)

Schneider, Herbert W. *Religion in 20th Century America.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1954. Pp. x, 244. $4.25.)

Shanahan, William O. *German Protestants Face the Social Question.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1954. Pp. xii, 434. $6.75.)

Shaw, J. G. *The Story of the Rosary.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1954. Pp. xi, 175. $3.25.)

Sheen, Fulton J. *Peace of Soul.* (New York: Doubleday Image Books. 1954. Pp. 264. $.75.)

Smith, Harrison. *Britain in Malta.* 2 Vols. (Valetta Malta: Progress Press Co. Ltd. 1954. Pp. xvii, 257; xviii, 204. $3.75 for both volumes; $2.00 each.)

Snyder, Louis L. *The Meaning of Nationalism.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1954. Pp. xv, 208. $4.50.)

Soriano, Manuel Barcia. *El conquistador español del siglo XVI.* (Tucumán: Universidad Nacional de Tucumán. 1954. Pp. 101.)

Thayer, Theodore. *Pennsylvania Politics and the Growth of Democracy, 1740-1776.* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. 1954. Pp. x, 234.)

Turnwald, Wilhelm K. (Ed.) and Gerda Johannsen (Trans.). *Documents on the Expulsion of the Sudeten Germans.* (Munich: Association for the Protection of Sudeten German Interests. 1953. Pp. xxix, 308.)

van den Wyngaert, Anastasius, et Georgius Mensaert, O.F.M. (Eds.). *Sinica Franciscana.* Vol. V: *Relationes et Epistolas, Illmi D. Fr. Bernardini della Chiesa, O.F.M.* (Rome: Collegio di S. Antonio. 1954. Pp. lxiii, 895.)

Von Fritz, Kurt. *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity—A Critical Analysis of Polybius' Political Ideas.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1954. Pp. xiv, 490. $7.50.)

Weed, Seward, Hughes and McIlvaine. *Mission Abroad, 1861-1862.* [Microcard.] (Rochester: University of Rochester Press. 1954.)

Winston, Richard. *Charlemagne from the Hammer to the Cross.* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc. 1954. Pp. vii, 346. $3.75.)

Wyllie, Irvin G. *The Self-Made Man in America.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1954. Pp. viii, 210. $4.00.)

Zornow, William Frank. *Lincoln and the Party Divided.* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1954. Pp. xi, 264. $4.00.)

Zwetsloot. *Friedrich Spee und die Hexenprozesse—Die Stellung und Bedeutung der Cautio Criminalis.* (Trier: Paulinus—Verlag. 1954. Pp. 345. 19 DM.)